



RIGHT IS MIGHT

Abraham Chibamba

RIGHT IS MIGHT

Abraham Chibamba

© Abraham Chabamba
Published in Zimbabwe by PLO 1990

ISBN

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the PLO.

Printed in Zimbabwe by Jongwe

FOREWORD

Abraham Chibamba's book could not have been better timed. It comes at an exciting time in terms of the unprecedented developments which have taken place in Eastern Europe and Africa. There has also been tremendous progress in East-West relations as the super powers mistrust each other less and trust each other more. All these developments have led to a relaxation of both world and regional tensions.

It is a matter of utmost regret that while progress is being made elsewhere, the search for a solution of the Palestinian question continues to elude mankind. It is undeniable that there has been a strong link between Israel and South Africa which has extended to such critical areas of defence and security.

Abraham Chibamba's book has addressed itself to this relationship in a global context and he has pointed out how it relates to the present world of detente and reconciliation. The people of Palestine have not known any peace throughout this century. They have been victims of international machinations and conspiracies which have sought justice for others except the Palestinians.

Until the people of Palestine exercise their inalienable rights to self-determination the Middle East will remain at war with itself. They have a right to live within secure and recognised boundaries; right to life and property; right to education; right to self-respect; right to freedom and all other things which go with it.

Unless the International Community recognises and accepts its moral, political and historic responsibility to the people of Palestine, international peace and security will remain an illusion. I congratulate Abraham Chibamba for this well researched and written work which gives us an African perspective to the problem.

Vernon J. Mwaanga
Lusaka
3rd August, 1990

DEDICATION

To Abraham Mulenga Chimasa, my cousin, and his family in whose home much of this work was done:

INTRODUCTION

The period 1985 to 1989 will long be remembered for: the wave of liberalization that dramatically, almost overnight, changed the face of East Europe; the equally dramatic moves towards the Namibian independence and the relaxation in tension this led to in Southern Africa as well as for the epoch-making people's uprisings against intolerable oppression in Palestine and South Africa.

It was Mikhail Gorbachev who set the ball rolling soon after he had become leader of the Soviet society in 1985. Gorbachev surprised the world when he, boldly, came up with a programme of reform in a country that had grown accustomed to outmoded and, sometimes, even unworkable principles of totalitarian rule that tended more to stifle human initiative than to boost it. He took steps towards restructuring the Soviet society into a modern human society in conformity with the social, economic and political changes that were taking place elsewhere in the world which he intended the Soviet people to feel part of. This, in a nutshell, is what he meant by *Perestroika*. He also took steps towards opening up the Soviet society to the outside world, in order to remove that suspicion there that suggested that there was a lot to hide in the Soviet Union and to rid Communism of that sinister tag the Western world had put on it. This was *Glasnost*. Accordingly, Gorbachev introduced reforms to affect practically every sphere of Soviet life, including the hitherto almost unheard of freedom of speech and of movement as well as a reduction in press censorship. In short, Gorbachev intended to give Communism a human head and a human heart, so that the rest of the world could stop looking at the Soviets as if they were monsters or people from another planet. The changes that took place in East Europe as a result of Gorbachev's reform programme, despite the tragic note they struck in Romania, were almost unbelievable. At first, Gorbachev was not

Introduction

taken seriously by the outside world, particularly by the Western world. However after he had met some leaders in the West, such as the then President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan, and Mrs Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain, his sincerity and seriousness could not be doubted any longer. Besides, was this not the man Mrs Thatcher in December, 1984, had hailed as someone she could do business with?

Soon, the West and the Soviet Union got down to serious business to remove the suspicions that for decades had bedevilled relations between them. The talks between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan, to remove the dangers of nuclear war, were made possible, it was felt in many parts of the world, by Mr. Gorbachev's efforts. The talks culminated in the two men signing a treaty to ban medium range missiles, in December, 1987. Then followed a period of detente that was marked by closer co-operation and greater understanding of each other's position in the world, between the United States and the Soviet Union, evidenced by their heads of state exchanging visits. The tension given rise to by, in particular, Afghanistan eased considerably, as the Soviets pulled their troops out of that country early in 1989, and this worked for peace everywhere in the world.

Some people believe that it was the Gorbachev reform programme that stirred up the strong nationalistic sentiment that took expression in demands for autonomy in a number of Soviet republics and in the satellite states of Hungary and Poland. Thus in the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, demands were made for greater control over their national affairs than they had been permitted by Moscow until then. In Armenia, a dispute with neighbouring Azerbaijan over Nagorno Karabach ceded to the latter by Moscow in 1923, led to serious anti-Moscow demonstrations in which the Armenian national spirit was clearly discernible. Demonstrations for some form of autonomy or against the established order also took place in Georgia and Uzbekistan. In both Hungary and Poland, the move towards democracy became so strong that many people began to wonder for how much longer these two would continue to belong to the Communist Bloc. By an overwhelming majority, the Polish Parliament in August, 1989, confirmed the appointment of a non-communist and member of

Introduction

Solidarity as Prime Minister. Thus for the first time in forty years, i.e., since the end of the Second World War, there was a government in Poland, that was not dominated by communists. Undoubtedly, what lay at the bottom of all this was Polish nationalism and man's quest for genuine free choice or freedom. Simply put, the Poles and other peoples of East Europe, wanted to be left alone to do things their own way.

The wave of nationalist sentiment in East Europe reverberated in many other parts of the world. It is difficult to say, however, whether they were related, but in several parts of Asia and Latin America, such as South Korea and El Salvador, respectively, this took the form of demonstrations or riots or, indeed, armed struggle against unpopular governments. But serious nationalist resentment of tyranny and racial oppression led to eruptions of violence in Palestine and South Africa, where people, Palestinians and the black peoples of South Africa got together and, as one man, rose up with greater determination and zeal than ever before to release their pent-up fury against the related forces of occupation and racial oppression, represented by Zionist Israel and apartheid South Africa. Israel and South Africa have much in common, both being products of British imperialism, but nurtured and sustained by the United States of America, as outposts, in their strategy to rid the Middle East and Southern Africa of communist influence. It is worth noting that both Israel and South Africa, as they are at the moment, are also products of racial persecution and war — the Second World War, in the case of the former, and the Great Boer War, in the case of the latter. It was the bitter experiences of these wars that fanned the fires of nationalism in both the Jews and the Boers and spurred them on towards the establishment of their respective states as safeguards against repetitions of such experiences in future. Their similar past experiences and what they looked on as their common destiny, namely the creation, in their respective regions, of societies on the Western model, brought the Jews and Boers together as allies and comrades in arms. United, the Israelis and Boers have done much to weaken Afro-Arab co-operation and solidarity. This, in itself, is a challenge enough to rekindle the nationalist zeal in the Afro-Arab world for greater co-operation and unity of purpose at both regional and national lev-

Introduction

els. Division, as is the case over Lebanon or Angola, can only lead to disaster. Israel and South Africa benefit from such division. Therefore, African or Arab unity is an absolute necessity.

Widespread riots and demonstrations reinforced by strikes and armed struggle shook South Africa from about 1984, while Palestine exploded towards the end of 1987. The Palestinian uprising or Intifada and the uprising by the black peoples of South Africa, for which I have coined the name 'Amandla' uprising, may have been totally unrelated to the cataclysmic changes in East Europe. However, they had one thing in common. They were all expressions of a strong national sentiment for self-determination, freedom and independence. But the two struggles, Palestinian and African, have several features in common. They are both nationalist against what one might call proxies of imperialism, Zionist Israel and apartheid South Africa, for freedom and independence. They both seek the return of expropriated or occupied lands. They are both directed at regimes that are racial and brutally repressive. They both have the realization of the national aspirations of the oppressed peoples of Palestine and South Africa, as their principal goal; that is, the Palestinian and African peoples to be able to conduct their own affairs independently of all other people so as to be able to shape their own destiny. To do this, the two struggles aim at the undoing of the injustice done the people of Palestine and of South Africa. Nevertheless, they are both expressions of a very deep desire by the people of Palestine and of South Africa to live in peace, freedom and human dignity, as PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, put it when he addressed the 43rd session of the United Nations General Assembly in Geneva on 13 December, 1988:

"We are a people that yearns for peace — and perhaps with greater enthusiasm, considering our long years of suffering and the harsh conditions that plague us and our children, who are deprived of the normalcy of a life free of war, free of tragedy, free of the torment of exile, free of homelessness and daily anguish." — (Paul Theodoulou — "Palestinian Children and the Intifada" — Bissan Press, 1989, Introduction).

Both the Palestinians and black peoples of South Africa are denied peace, freedom and human dignity by the oppressive regimes of Israel and South Africa. But the current trend of events through-

Introduction

out the world is towards the relaxation of tension; towards the breaking down of barriers, such as the Berlin Wall, that separate man from man, and above all, towards genuine peace and freedom for all.

It is an undeniable fact of history that any force whatsoever that tampers with the dignity of man, particularly that which reduces or denigrates the value of human life, the way the Israelis and Boers do as demonstrated by their brutal suppression of Palestinian or African agitation for human rights, deserves universal condemnation because these deeds offend morality and are, therefore, wrong or evil. It is right or morally defensible to seek the removal of that which offends morality or that which is wrong or evil. In other words, the Palestinian and African struggles seeking the removal of the injustice that Zionism and apartheid have done the Arabs and black peoples of South Africa, are morally defensible or right.

There has been a growing realization, in both the Palestinian and African camps, that, while it is essential to examine carefully every opportunity that arises conducive to dialogue or negotiation, there should be no giving in to the enemy who, himself, has conceded nothing substantial. Thus both the PLO and South African black nationalist movements refuse to give up the armed struggle unless Israel and South Africa show readiness for serious and meaningful negotiations. There are no signs of this yet, although the authorities in South Africa have been talking of introducing reforms in the apartheid system about which they have shown some vague signs of willingness to negotiate. However, one thing is certain, and that is however long the confrontation between the Palestinians and Africans, on the one hand, and Israelis and Boers, on the other, defeat awaits Zionism and apartheid. Several events during the period 1987 to 1989 in both the Middle East and in Southern Africa pointed to this. The United States and several of their allies in Western Europe, for the first time ever, had direct talks with the PLO and the ANC. The PLO recognized Israel's right to existence and renounced the use of violence to bring about change. Israel showed some willingness to talk, but only to "moderate" Palestinians. These, plus the US abstention from voting in the UN Security Council at the end of August, 1989, on a resolution deploring Israeli deportations of Palestinians from the occupied territo-

Introduction

ries, facilitating the adoption of the resolution, were developments that had no precedent in the Middle East crisis.

In Southern Africa, dramatic but very significant developments took place during the same period. The OAU, through the Front-line states, initiated steps to end the Angolan civil war and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, paving the way to the territory's independence. Matters were brought to a head by South Africa's defeat at the hands of a combined force of Angolan and Cuban troops during the fight for the control of the strategic town of Cuito Cuanavale in South-East Angola at the end of 1987. Thereafter, to extricate itself from its uncalled for involvement in South-West Africa, South Africa showed ready willingness to negotiate. US involvement in the negotiations to end the Angolan civil war and to bring independence to Namibia was crucial. Independence for Namibia was assured by SWAPO's victory at the polls in the UN-supervised elections at the beginning of November, 1989.

All eyes are now turned on Israel and South Africa. The two must give way to the irrepressible forces of human decency. For that which is right can never be suppressed for ever.

Abraham Mulenga Chibamba.

One

A BRIEF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Ever since the United Nations came into being in 1945, no two states have been as much criticized, censured and, indeed, condemned as Israel and South Africa have because of the policies they pursue as the basis of their statehood and because of the contributory factors to as well as reasons for their existence as states, which many nations in the world do not consider as fair or justifiable. Ironically, South Africa is a founder member of the United Nations, her participation in the founding of the world body having been sponsored by the British Government of the time, as one of the dominions of the empire over which the sun never set. Israel joined the United Nations a few years later, her passage to nationhood having been paved and smoothed by what appeared to be intrigues and machinations of certain British politicians, none as noteworthy as Arthur James Balfour who, as Foreign Secretary from 1916 to 1919, issued the well-known "Balfour Declaration" in 1917, by which a national home for Jews was to be established in Palestine. The Balfour Declaration was part of a letter Balfour wrote on 2 November, 1917, to Lord Rothschild, Chairman of the British Zionist Federation, stating among other things that:

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights

A Brief Historical Background

and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.”

This declaration eventually led to the founding of the state of Israel in May, 1948. That is to say that what is known today as the Jewish state of Israel is a British creation in much the same sense as is what is known as the Republic of South Africa. The two states were founded by the British as a sop to Jews and Boers, with memories of bitter experiences in Europe and Southern Africa and determined to preserve their identity regardless of what the rest of the world thought or said.

The British established a military administration in Palestine in 1917, during World War I after the defeat of the Turks who had held the territory since about 1516. The League of Nations, precursor to the United Nations, granted Britain a mandate over Palestine in 1922. The mandate incorporated the Balfour Declaration, and some 300 000 Jewish immigrants entered the territory between 1920 and 1939, mainly from Europe and the United States. The British administrators also made it easy for the Jews to acquire land in Palestine at the expense of the Arab majority who, as far as is known, have always lived in the territory. Some historians trace Arab presence in Palestine to about 636 or to the conquest of Palestine by Moslem Arabs or after the collapse of the Byzantine Empire, but earlier writers on the Middle East would suggest that the Arabs have been in Palestine much longer than this. For instance, many scholars of ancient history believe that the city of Jerusalem, proclaimed in 1980 by the Israelis as ‘the eternal capital of Israel’, was founded by a people known as Canaanites in the eighteenth century B.C., and it remained their city for 800 years before it was captured by King David, an Israelite, about 1000 B.C. King David founded the kingdom of Judah after he had subdued the Canaanites.

It should be noted that there is no relationship between the majority of the Israelis, many of whom are converts to Judaism, and the Israelites. The Jews of Palestine or descendants of the Israelites still live in Palestine to the present moment. They constitute a tiny minority and, often, are in opposition to the policies of the Israeli Government, especially towards the Palestinian Arabs. The Jews who came to Palestine towards the end of the nineteenth century, or the founders of the state of Israel came largely from

A Brief Historical Background

Europe and were, in the main, converts to Judaism. They have no racial relationship with the biblical Israelites, much as they claim to be descendants of the Patriarch Abraham.

The Canaanites are believed to be the earliest inhabitants of Palestine, having settled there about the year 3000 B.C. Together with the Philistines who came from Illyria about 1175 B.C. and settled in the east and south of Palestine, the Canaanites are the ancestors of today's Palestinians. It is the Canaanites who gave to Palestine its biblical name of 'the land of Canaan', and from the Philistines is derived the name of Palestine.

The Israelites, who are claimed by the Israelis as their ancestors, were not indigenous to Palestine. They came to the land of Canaan or Palestine about 1200 B.C. after fleeing from bondage in Egypt. Having overrun Canaan, the Israelites did not massacre its inhabitants or evict them from their lands or cities, but settled among them and cohabited together. It is not possible in this brief narrative to give a detailed account of the history of the Israelites in Palestine. Suffice it to state that theirs was a very turbulent and chequered history. For example, the Kingdom of Juda established by King David about 1000 B.C. was destroyed 73 years later, and Palestine was subjected to successive conquests, namely: by the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks and the Romans. Finally, the presence of the Israelites in Palestine was brought to an end with their deportation from there by the Romans consequent upon their revolts against Roman rule between 66 and 70 A.D. and from 132 to 135 A.D. The temple in Jerusalem and the city itself were razed to the ground, and the Jews or Israelites either killed or deported. The city was later rebuilt by Roman Emperor Hadrian who renamed it Aelia Capitolina and issued a decree which prohibited, under pain of death, the presence of Jews in the city. The prohibition remained in force for several centuries, but was relaxed by the Moslems after their capture of the city about 636 A.D. Nevertheless very few Jews lived in the city. A Spanish rabbi, Moise Ben Nahman, who visited the city in 1267 A.D. found only two Jews there. But, following the persecution of Jews in many parts of Western Europe and their expulsion from Spain in 1492 and from Portugal in 1496, a small number of them returned to Palestine. More Jews sought refuge into Palestine as a result of the Rus-

A Brief Historical Background

sian pogroms of 1881 – 1882 and settled in Tiberias and Safed as well as in Jerusalem. Jewish population in Jerusalem swole to about 30 000 towards the end of World War One in 1917.

In other words, the city of Jerusalem was ruled by the Canaanites, its founders, for 800 years; by the Israelites from about 1000 B.C. to about 587 B.C., i.e., about 400 years; by the Babylonians, Persians, Macedonians or Greeks and Romans — except for the period of the revolt by the Maccabees — for about 900 years until about 324 – 614, 628 – 638, 1099 – 1187 and 1229 – 1239 A.D. for about 400 years; by Moslems (Arabs and Turks) from about 636 – 1099, 1187 – 1229 and 1239 – 1917, for nearly 1200 years.

The Palestinians have survived all these vicissitudes, and have lived in Jerusalem ever since it was founded by their ancestors.

It should be noted that the moslem conquest of Jerusalem of the 7th century entailed no demographic change or colonization by the conquerors. The Arab moslems, who were fewer in numbers than the Palestinians, were chiefly interested in establishing their rule and spreading their religion among the conquered people who were Arabs like themselves.

Also worth noting is that Arabs are a pre-Christianity as well as a pre-Islam people who lived in the various regions of the Middle East as they still do and spoke the same language, had the same habits and customs although they had different religious beliefs. Many of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were Christian at the time of the moslem conquest. The moslems succeeded in converting some to Islam, but others retained their Christian faith to the present moment.

After the deportation of the Jews, Jerusalem remained a predominantly Arab city and took on Arab characteristics which it retained for 1800 years until the occupation of Palestine by the British in 1917. The Arab character of the city of Jerusalem began to change with the arrival of the Zionist Jews whose immigration was allowed and encouraged by the British administrators as provided for by the Balfour Declaration against the will and wishes of the original inhabitants of Palestine.

Jewish land acquisition in Palestine was fiercely resisted by the Arabs who, to make their point clear, also rebelled against British rule which had made this possible. There were countrywide strikes,

A Brief Historical Background

demonstrations and other forms of protest in 1929 and from 1936 to 1938. But after the second World War, Zionists pressed for the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine, after they had turned down the British offer of Uganda for the purpose. The Arabs, on the other hand, demanded independence for Palestine, which indeed, they had been promised by the British, but Jewish terrorist activities to back up the establishment of their national home disrupted this. There came into being such secret organisations as the Haganah and the Irgun Zvai Leumi to which several well-known Israeli personalities, including the one time Premier of Israel, Mr. Menachem Begin, belonged. These organisations employed terror to press Jewish demands. Perhaps, the most notorious of the organisations was the one known as the "Stern Gang" which in 1948 murdered Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, who had been sent out to Palestine by the United Nations to mediate between the two warring parties, the Arabs and the Jews.

In 1947, the very tense situation in Palestine was referred to the United Nations for their arbitration. The General Assembly devoted two sessions to consider a resolution sponsored by the United States of America and whose subsequent adoption was largely influenced by President Harry Truman. The resolution called for the termination of the British mandate and the partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish states as well as the establishment of Jerusalem and its environs that included Bethlehem and Bethany, as a *corpus separatum*, or a place excluded from all the rest of the territory, to be administered by the Trusteeship Council on behalf of the United Nations; thus giving the place an international status. However, completely disregarding all this, the Jews proclaimed the state of Israel on 14 May, 1948. During the war that broke out immediately after that, between the new state and the states of the Arab League, Israel not only seized modern Jerusalem and most of the area allocated to the establishment of the Arab state, but also expelled all the Arab inhabitants of modern Jerusalem as well as most Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

The partitioning of Palestine by the United Nations, influenced largely by the Americans and their allies, was seen by the Arabs as a deliberate move by imperialist powers opposed to Arab na-

A Brief Historical Background

tionalism, to deprive them of their land and to kill their national aspirations for an independent and free Palestine. It also set the stage for the interminable conflict between the Arabs and the Jews, that, indeed, soon followed: the conflict that has characterised relations between the two peoples. The Arabs refused both to recognize the new state of Israel and to have anything to do with it, apart from steps they took to eliminate it. They kept up the fight against both the Jewish state and against those nations, particularly in the Western World, without whose support Israel could not exist, with the view of undoing the injustice done against them by British imperialism and world Zionism supported mainly from the United States of America where, though a tiny minority, the Jews had become very influential and powerful because of the enormous wealth and big finances that they both had and controlled. It was the United States which had become the bastion of world Zionism and Israel's main backer. With the support she received from the United States, Israel was soon able to build a very powerful army, equipped with the latest and most sophisticated American weapons that enabled her not only to fight in pursuit of her expansionist programme, but also to suppress Arab resistance to her aggression. In 1967, following the six-day war, Israel gained more territory by occupying the Golan Heights part of Syria, the West Bank and the city of Jerusalem, Gaza and the Sinai Peninsula.

The main driving force or the basis of Israeli nationalism is Zionism, a movement founded by Theodor Herzl in 1896 when he published "Jewish State", a book in which he outlined a scheme for erecting an autonomous Jewish commonwealth under Turkish suzerainty. This, later, led to the establishment of the Zionist Organization at Basle in Switzerland in 1897. During the First World War, Chaim Weizmann, one of the best-known Zionist leaders of the time and the man who became Israel's first president, managed to secure a promise from the British Government that they would support the creation in Palestine of a Jewish "national home" after the war.

In 1652, a group of Dutch sailors led by a man called Jan van Riebeck, landed at the Cape in South Africa. van Riebeck had been instructed by the Dutch East India Company, his employers, to set up a small station at the Cape, mid-point between Europe and

A Brief Historical Background

the East Indies, to provide Dutch ships bound for the East Indies with fresh vegetables, water, wheat and meat. At the Cape, the Dutch found two stone-age African peoples, the San, whom the Dutch called 'Bushmen', and the Khoikhoi who, because of the explosive clicks in their language, the Dutch, onomatopoeically, referred to as the 'Hott-en-tot' (hott-and-tot). Differences over land and cattle between the Africans and the Dutch settlers led to the latter killing off so many Bushmen and Hottentots that many of the surviving Bushmen fled inland into the Kalahari Desert, while brothel activity by the settlers among the few Hottentots who survived the Dutch slaughter, resulted in a new community that came to be known as 'Coloured', or people of mixed race, whose numbers were augmented by further cohabitation between the Dutch and slaves brought in from India, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Madagascar, Angola, Mozambique and the East Indies (Indonesia). The Hottentots as a race, virtually ceased to exist. The whiteman took over all their land and cattle as well.

Gradually, the Dutch settlers began to move inland in search of more land and cattle. But, in the neighbourhood, not very far from the Cape, they encountered black African communities who had inhabited Southern Africa for centuries. Some sources, basing themselves on radiocarbon dating, suggest that these black African communities were to be found in Southern Africa as far back as the fifth century A.D. They included the Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Swazi, Tswana, Pedi and Venda as well as a motley of smaller communities. Disputes over land between the settlers and the Africans soon led to friction and then to war.

The Dutch had begun to grab land wherever they could in order to increase the productivity of the Cape settlement. They were later to claim that much of the vast expanses of land they drove the Africans from by force of arms had been empty when they first sighted them. But, of course, quite often, the land they grabbed belonged to one or more of the African communities mentioned earlier; hence the wars.

Following the French sweep over the Netherlands at the end of the eighteenth century, the British occupied the Cape and parts of the East Indies. At the Cape, the British introduced the first

A Brief Historical Background

pass laws to help Dutch farmers or Boers. They decreed that the Khoikhoi (Hottentot) must have a fixed place of abode from which movement without a pass, was illegal and the offender was liable to imprisonment or compulsory work for the Boers. However, when the British Parliament outlawed negro slavery throughout the Empire in 1833, the Boers, who had all along resented British rule which they regarded as unfair and unjust, in protest, left the Cape colony about 1836, to look for new homes elsewhere in Southern Africa, where they intended to be independent of the British. This is what is known as the Great Trek. The Boers or Afrikaners likened their flight from British rule to that of the biblical children of Israel from Egypt to Canaan or the Promised Land.

The Boers established two republics, both independent of the British. They named them the Orange Free State and the South African Republic or Transvaal. However, the independence of the two republics was shortlived; for the British soon appeared on the scene to interfere in the affairs of the republics. The discovery of gold on the Rand, in the South African Republic, in 1886 led to an influx of quick-money seekers who were mostly British and who soon engaged themselves in activities that were directed at undermining the independence and sovereignty of the Transvaal, such as the Jameson Raid, or a British sponsored uprising against the Government of the Transvaal by the disenfranchised British money seekers whom the Boers referred to as 'uitlanders' or foreigners, which the Boers quickly put down. The uprising had the effect of uniting all the Boers throughout Southern Africa to such an extent that they prepared themselves for war which, they were convinced, the British were planning in order to deprive the two Boer republics of their independence and bring them, once again, under British rule. Matters came to a head towards the end of the nineteenth century when the agitation for the franchise by the uitlanders on the Rand grew in intensity and British pressure on the Government of the Transvaal on behalf of the uitlanders increased. The Boers refused to budge, and war broke out in 1899. During the war, known as the Great Boer War, thousands of Boers who included old people, women and children, were rounded up by the British and placed into concentration camps in which they suffered extreme hardship and disease. Many died. The Great Boer

A Brief Historical Background

War ended with the signing of the Peace Treaty of Vereeniging in 1902.

The Peace Treaty of Vereeniging provided for British annexation of the two Boer republics, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal, which, together with the British provinces of the Cape and Natal, after the Act of Union of 1910, formed what is known today as South Africa. As a sop to the vanquished and embittered Boers, and in an endeavour by the British to induce the Boers to remain in the British Empire, Britain granted dominion status to South Africa and handed the administration of the territory to the Boers, without any safeguards to protect the interests of the black majority who, like the Arabs in Palestine, were thus placed at the mercy of a vengeful and self-seeking people.

Thus by giving a helping hand in the creation of the two states, Israel and South Africa, Britain overlooked the interests of two peoples, the Arabs and the Africans, ironically, both of whom had been loyal subjects of the British Empire and had co-operated with the British against the Turks in Palestine and against the Boers in South Africa during the First World War and the Great Boer War respectively. Nay, the two peoples had aided British war effort against Nazi Germany as well.

Was British connivance in the creation of Israel and South Africa an act of betrayal or was it indicative of short-sightedness or irresponsibility? Many people in Britain today answer these questions in the affirmative.

Like the Israelis in Palestine, the majority of the Boers embarked on steps towards the creation of a 'national home' for themselves in South Africa, at the expense of the black majority as the British looked on. A date of special significance for both Israel and South Africa is the year 1948 which saw the realization of the Jewish ambition of many years in the creation of the state of Israel and the emergence of the Nationalists in South Africa, who in a whites-only general election fought that year, soundly defeated the vacillating pro-British 'liberal' idealists led by General Jan Smuts.

The Nationalists had their own Chaim Weizmann in the person of Dr. D.F. Malan, the principal architect of their national philosophy of apartheid or separate development which had, as its main object, the preservation of the Boer identity and the main-

A Brief Historical Background

tenance of the white man in South Africa in positions of power and authority, as a privileged person, at the expense of the black man who was to be used as a tool in the furtherance of the white man's interests *ad infinitum*. But, at the bottom of apartheid lay a great fear of the Boers competing with the black majority, lest the Boers be swamped. Moreover, the blacks, like the Arabs in Palestine regarding Israel, never accepted a South Africa dominated by the Boers, guided by the philosophy of apartheid which many people today equate with Zionism, although the Israelis deny that the latter has anything to do with racism. But almost everything the Jews have done to Palestine and its Arab inhabitants as well as to the city of Jerusalem since the creation of the state of Israel, contradicts this denial.

For many centuries, as has already been discussed, the population of Jerusalem was almost exclusively Arab. This changed suddenly and dramatically following and consequent upon the creation of the state of Israel by the Jews, who were at the same time Zionists. Whereas during the British mandate, the process of the demographical change of the city of Jerusalem consisted in gradual and regulated Jewish immigration into Palestine, the new state adopted an entirely different process which consisted in the forcible substitution of one population for another; in this case, the expulsion of Palestinians and the settlement of Jews in the homes of the expelled Palestinians. Moreover, in 1950, Israel enacted a law called the Law of Return by which, while barring the repatriation of Palestinian refugees, Israel granted to every Jew in the world potential citizenship, the right to live in Israel as well as automatic acquisition of nationality on arrival. Thus by 1985, Jewish population in Jerusalem had risen from 99 690 in 1946 to 280 000, compared to the Palestinian population which, during the same period dropped from more than 800 000 to a mere 120 000. The state of Israel had worked out a deliberate programme aimed at the complete Judaization of the population of the city, which resulted in the de-christianization and de-moslemization of the city of Jerusalem which, for a very long time, was a holy city and very important centre for both these religions, namely Christianity and Islam. Henceforth, only Judaism would be allowed and supported by law; thus doing away with the ageless three spiritual dimen-

A Brief Historical Background

sions of Jerusalem which had, hitherto, been regarded by the whole world as the sacred city and important pilgrimage centre for Christians, moslems and Jews. Against this background alone, Jewish denials that Zionism has anything to do with racism, do not seem to hold very much water.

There is a striking parallel between Israel and South Africa. They are both products of British imperialism, as we have seen, created behind the backs of people, Palestinians and Africans, who, for a long time, had been loyal subjects of the British Empire, in order to accommodate ruthless, racist minority cliques who, for reasons of survival, were bent on suppressing the majority indigenous peoples and to deny them basic human rights. It does not help the Israelis or the Boers to deny this, because everything that takes place within the borders of their respective states points to this. Both Israel and South Africa derive their strength from most nations in the West, particularly the United States of America. Both have been accused, by the world at large, of pursuing policies of racial discrimination and supremacy, stemming from their ideologies, Zionism and apartheid. Both are expressions of extreme nationalism which gives them the character of obduracy and aggressiveness and which masks their inherent vulnerability or the reason why those seeking their destruction or fundamental change must succeed. Both use terror to suppress their victims, Palestinians and Africans, or to intimidate them and anyone who supports them, as is borne out by current events in both countries, torn by racial strife and violence, in which both have been using excessive force and firearms against unarmed civilian populations, called 'kragdadigheid' by the Boers in South Africa. Both are treated as pariahs by the international community which refuses to have anything to do with them openly. Israel has diplomatic ties with only seventy-five nations out of the total number of about 160 UN member nations, as compared with more than 150 nations that recognise the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). South Africa has diplomatic relations with a paltry thirty-five nations. Both resent and reject bona fide secular democracy as a development that they would accommodate at their own national peril. Therefore calls by the local peoples for the creation of democratically run societies are rejected out of hand. Both try to justify the occupation or

A Brief Historical Background

possession of the land they regard as their own with suggestions that, in the case of the Jews in Palestine, the Palestinian Arabs left their lands voluntarily in response to calls by other Arabs in the neighbourhood for evacuation in the face of Zionist onslaught and, in the case of the Boers, that there was nobody else apart from the Bushmen and Hottentots when the first Dutch settlers arrived. This fits in well in the Zionist fiction of "a land without people for a people without land".

Both look upon local native peoples, i.e., Palestinians and Africans, as sources of cheap labour which they harness by placing local peoples into specially selected and often restricted areas, well away from cities or towns where the dominant groups reside, or Bantustans in South Africa, which function as reservoirs of cheap labour, often employed on menial tasks which are looked down upon by workers of the dominant groups. To control the movements of the people in the labour reservoirs, the dominant or ruling classes issue identity cards or passes without which employment in towns or cities or anywhere else is not possible and, often, presence without identity cards or passes in the residential areas of the ruling class, lands the dominated peoples into serious trouble, which includes detention or imprisonment. Both practise censorship of the mass media, i.e., newspapers, magazines, radio and television. Often, even private mail is tampered with for what is said to be security reasons. Both pooh-pooh United Nations calls for the observance of human rights by all member nations as well as condemnation for breaches thereof. Thus, in both Israel and South Africa, torture; arbitrary arrest; imprisonment without trial; deportation; excessive use of firearms by security forces on unarmed civilians; bannings; beatings; family separation; suppression of native cultural identity or ethnic cohesion; denial and suppression of political rights and trampling on national aspirations of dominated peoples; denial of native representation in anything that would meaningfully promote their well-being, material of spiritual; house demolitions; violations of home privacy; curfews and highhandedness are part of state policy. Both use their opposition to Communism to deny dominated peoples free political expression. Both are victims of post-traumatic psychosis by which they are pre-occupied with their own past suffering, becoming in-

A Brief Historical Background

sensitive to the sufferings of others. They think that, because they suffered so much at the hands of other people (Nazis and the British), no one can suffer as much as they did, or any other type of suffering is nothing compared to their own. Their extreme sense of security seems to expose paranoia of brutality towards others, similar to what they themselves experienced at the hands of the Nazis or the British. In the face of so much hostility from the rest of the world, so Israel and South Africa believe, they should both maintain large, well-drilled, extremely well-equipped armies all the time on war footing. As well, they have turned themselves into huge armaments factories, busy manufacturing the latest and the most sophisticated American, British, French or Italian weapons of war or modifications of these and other tools of mass destruction human intelligence is capable of designing, which they exchange between themselves or amass for sale. The two refuse to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and to permit inspection of their nuclear facilities by international agencies, which leaves their hands free to carry out nuclear tests as frequently as they wish. However, the horrors of World War Two and the most revolting degradation man can inflict on fellow man, that was the lot of Jews under Nazi Germany should never be repeated by any nation against another, least of all the Jews. It boggles the mind how such people should, themselves, harass, persecute or discriminate against other people less fortunate or weaker than themselves. Both Israel and South Africa, as demonstrated by their dealings with the Arab and African populations within their borders, are brutally repressive, as will be illustrated later in the book, and, indeed, as is known all over the world.

Under normal circumstances, both Jews and Boers should be natural allies of the down-trodden, under-privileged and oppressed masses of the world in their fight against the evils of oppressive domination of any kind. But they have succumbed to the forces of exploitative capitalism and racialism, the very forces their forefathers fought so hard against. Indeed, the very forces they themselves thought they had overcome when they proclaimed the new states of Israel and South Africa.

Sometime in 1987, Television Zambia showed a film on a Nazi concentration camp in Eastern Poland, erected as part of Adolf Hi-

A Brief Historical Background

tlar's 'final solution' of the 'Jewish problem' or blood-congealing mass murder. The film showed hundreds of Jewish children and old people being carted away to the infamous gas chambers where they all perished, an altogether forbidding spectacle. After many of their relatives and friends had thus been murdered, several young and energetic Jews got together and planned an uprising against the guards of the camp which was situated at a place called Sobibor. The uprising itself was executed with masterly skill. Many guards were shot dead or stabbed to death at their posts as the Jewish inmates rose up in bitter fury to avenge the deaths of their people and to rescue themselves, something the Israelis today would call 'terrorism', if carried out by Palestinians against those who persecute and murder their people. The uprising ended in a grand break-out. Following a period of absolute pandemonium and confusion, thousands of the Jewish captives smashed their way or were pulled away through gates and barriers to freedom, sweet freedom, in the Ukraine and other adjacent parts of the Soviet Union.

Many Zambians who saw this film could not help being touched by what the Jews endured at Sobibor and, by popular demand, the film was shown again a few days later. If a film or mere pictures, although this one was based on a true story, could be so touching, the reality must have been shocking beyond words. This happened less than fifty years ago, and some of the victims of Nazism, an unforgettable piece of human tragedy - and the Jews would like the whole world to believe that nothing worse has or will ever happen - still live. How soon man forgets! These survivors of Hitlerism - several of them are prominent citizens of the state of Israel - are behind plans to deny Palestinians a home in the Middle East to which they belong and to wreak ruthless revenge on them when they fight for what is certainly their birthright or in self-defence.

Many South African whites or Boers died in World War Two fighting against what they believed was wrong, Hitlerism, although there were several among them who sympathized with Nazi Germany, for which they were interned by the British. After the war, some of them emerged as national heroes, none as notable as Balthazar John Vorster, a one time Prime Minister of South Africa and the man who was largely responsible for the forging of those close

A Brief Historical Background

links that are there today between Israel and South Africa. This is ridiculous incongruity! The man who, at best, would have remained indifferent to the horrors of the Nazi concentration camps including Sobibor or, at worst, would have lauded Hitlerism, was, at the same time a v.i.p. in Israel as prime minister of a neo-Nazi state! Vorster paid a state visit to Israel in 1976 and was given a red carpet reception, and, yet Israel still pursues Nazi or Hitler's war criminals!

This aside, many Boers fought in the war to banish Hitlerism, racial oppression, racial domination and injustice, represented by Hitlerism. After the war, they returned home to practise what they had been fighting against, themselves, which rendered their war effort worthless. For it was a contradiction in terms. The Boers, like the Israelis, refused to recognize that freedom and human dignity had a universal application. That is, they could not be confined to the Israelis or to the "whites" of South Africa. Other people want - and must have - freedom and human dignity. The alternative is war which nobody wants. Both the Palestinians and blacks of South Africa want freedom and human dignity. They must have these, if what is taking place in the Middle East and South Africa is to end. Just as Nazi Germany failed to live at peace with the rest of the world because she trampled on these fundamentals, so too will Israel and South Africa fail — and they have failed — to live at peace with the world around them. This, there is no doubt, they do not want. It took both the Israelis and Boers, particularly the former, hundreds, indeed, thousands of years of struggle to shake off the dust of humiliation, discrimination and persecution at the hands of many nations in Europe and at the hands of the British administrators in South Africa. Of Jewish experiences in Europe, Carlton J.H. Hayes has this to say:

“For centuries Jews had lived in Europe as a people distinct and apart from their Christian neighbours and legally on a lower plane. Into some countries they had not been permitted to enter; from other countries they had been banished; and in countries where they might reside they had long been compelled to live in particular sections of specified towns and to wear a distinctive dress and were forbidden to own land, to bear arms, to attend universities, to follow the learned profes-

A Brief Historical Background

sions, or to proselytize. They had usually been accorded 'privileges' but not 'rights'; they had been members of little Jewish states within European Nations, rather than being citizens of these nations....."

(Carlton J.H. Hayes - MODERN EUROPE TO 1870, Macmillan, 1960, p.403)

It has been suggested in some quarters that Palestine is the rightful homeland of the Jews, as is borne out by their history, part of which is contained in the Bible. But the same would appear true of the Arabs who, according to the same Bible - and the Jews do not deny this - are, together with the Jews descendants of the Patriarch Abraham. That is to say that the two antagonists over Palestine have, or should have, a common ancestry. But how come the Jews have expropriated Arab land and expelled its owners from Palestine, historically their common home? Some sources suggest that this is understandable on the basis of the very many and fundamental changes the Jews have undergone since their dispersal all over the world following the storming and sacking of Jerusalem by Roman Emperor Flavius Sabinus Vespasianus Titus in A.D. 70. They suffered racial admixture in many parts of Europe where they settled and, in a number of cases, to such an extent that, according to the Mosaic Law, which forbade marriages between Jews and gentiles, they virtually ceased to be Jews. Many of the founders of the state of Israel in 1948 were such Jews, and the Arabs generally viewed them as fakes or impostors who had no right to claim Palestine as their homeland.

The Afrikaners, on the other hand, lost their freedom and, virtually, became sojourners in their land, so to speak, almost immediately the British landed there on their empire-building mission. It was a most humiliating experience to the Boers who had relegated the indigenous African communities to positions of servility to, suddenly, find themselves subordinated to another white community in an area where they had for long grown accustomed to lording it over the "natives" or "Kaffirs" who, together, with them, became subjects of the same British Empire. To make matters worse, the British did not look upon the Boers as white people equal to themselves, but inferior and fit to do their bidding, the very reason why they colonized them. The Boers bitterly resent-

A Brief Historical Background

ed this and, when the British Parliament abolished negro slavery in 1833, a move the Boers partly interpreted to mean equating them with the "natives", almost to a man, they decided that was the last straw, and large numbers of them left the Cape Province to look for a new home elsewhere, well beyond, so they thought, the reach of the British (the Great Trek).

The Israelis, as we have seen, had their own Great Trek after the Second World War, when quite large numbers of them left Europe, where they had suffered so much, as a race, to set up a home for themselves in Palestine, where they were firmly resolved, no nation under the sun would again ever subject them to persecution or humiliation of any kind simply because they were Jews. The humiliation of the ghettos, the pogroms of Eastern Europe as well as the mass murders of the Nazi concentration camps, would never be permitted and, no Jewish blood would ever be spilt with impunity.

The parallelism between Israeli and Boer experiences and the very peculiar circumstances surrounding the two states of Israel and South Africa have given rise to a feeling of comradeship between the two, as is often the human reaction. In the face of worldwide condemnation of their policies and the very deep sense of rejection that the two suffer, it is only natural and quite human that they should look upon each other as allies and, aware of the support they have from the most powerful and richest nation on earth, the United States of America, both Israel and South Africa are quite prepared to defend most stubbornly that which they should know from their own history is wrong and, therefore, indefensible, namely, the denial of freedom and human dignity to people weaker than themselves. But, of course there is the fear of being swamped quite apart from the fear of Palestinian or African retribution, should they relent. To ward off this danger, both maintain large and extremely well equipped armies, all the time on war-footing. They have the tendency to react out of proportion to any provocation because of the very deep sense of insecurity inherent in their very existence as states. They are acutely aware that they do not owe their existence to popular local support. Hence, partly, the need for secret organizations such as the Israeli Irgun Zvai Leumi or the Stern Gang. The Boers had similar organisations such as the

A Brief Historical Background

Broederbond (brotherhood) or the extremist Ossewabrandwag (ox-waggon sentinel, symbolizing the Great Trek or Afrikaner nationalism), which the British outlawed, but to which many prominent Afrikaner leaders belonged. The Broederbond was there to promote and defend Afrikaner interests against the British League which was founded by the British to advance the political philosophy of British supremacy throughout South Africa. But the Ossewabrandwag had sinister intentions. Its members were anti-semitic and pro-Nazi Germany; hence its banning by the British authorities. The Ossewabrandwag, like the Jewish Stern Gang in Palestine, engaged itself in acts of sabotage, such as the blowing up of post offices and other communication centres as well as factories, in order to hamper British war effort in South Africa.

However, there is this distinction between Jewish resistance to British rule in Palestine and that by the Boers in South Africa. Whereas Israeli or Jewish nationalism in Palestine grew from strength to strength with British tacit support, although Jewish extremists were frowned upon and banned, the Boers looked upon the British as an enemy force of occupation whose rule should be resisted in every way possible and whose stay in South Africa, which the Boers regarded as their land, should be made uncomfortable, if not impossible. Real hostility, in other words, existed between the Boers and the British. The Jewish extremist organizations were not really hostile to the British. They looked upon the British authorities as a factor delaying the birth of the state of Israel rather than one preventing it. The terrorist acts they employed were, therefore, more a ploy to accelerate the birth of Israel and to intimidate the Arabs into submission to this fact than expressions of genuine hostility to British rule in Palestine. Boer extremists considered themselves to be at war with the British in South Africa because the British had imposed themselves on them by force of arms and were, therefore, an obstacle towards the realization of Boer national aspirations of establishing an Afrikaner republic in Southern Africa, extending from the Cape in the south to the Zambezi River in the north, an ideal they never abandoned. Eventually, as is known, the Boers did declare South Africa a republic outside the British Commonwealth on 31 May, 1961, thus fulfilling their national dream of many years. However, South Africa

A Brief Historical Background

remained within British sphere of influence and that of the West, like Israel. It is the West which sustains both Israel and South Africa, both of which function as outposts to guard political, economic and strategic interests of the West, for which, geographically, they are ideally situated. Israel is there to watch over the oil-rich Middle East, so that Soviet interests and influence do not extend there and the Mediterranean, a source of grave concern to the NATO alliance.

In 1914, Chaim Weizmann wrote that if Palestine were opened to Jewish settlement, then "England would have a country". England needed Palestine to safeguard approaches to Egypt about which she had very important imperial designs, from the west, through the Mediterranean, and from the east, through the Red Sea and Suez Canal. Like Israel, South Africa was of tremendous strategic, political and economic importance as it watched over the sea route that, via the Cape, linked Great Britain with her vast imperial possessions in India, Australia, New Zealand and the Far East, quite apart from South Africa itself. South Africa possessed the fabulous gold and diamond deposits that were capable of turning men into millionaires overnight. It had an enormous agricultural and pastoral potential. Moreover, Britain had extended her imperial ambitions to South Africa, which were well worth sustaining. Of course, Weizmann said nothing that the British did not already know, as events that followed, including the Balfour Declaration about which they did not need very much coaxing, clearly demonstrated.

Chaim Weizmann and Jan Smuts, destined to become first president of Israel and prime minister of South Africa respectively, had a meeting in London in June, 1917, to discuss ways and means of exploiting British imperial interests to the advantage of their respective people. Chaim Weizmann and other Zionists had their eyes already fixed on Palestine, while Smuts was thinking of forming a political party which would be "open to all white men whether Boer, Jew or Briton."

That meeting constituted the basis of the understanding and co-operation that brought Israel and South Africa together and formed the basis of the alliance that exists between the two to the present moment. Although there were many anti-semitic racialists among

A Brief Historical Background

them, the Boers could not ignore the very important contribution made by South Africa's Jews to the economy of the country, going back to the days of the gold-rush towards the end of the nineteenth century when Jewish magnates such as: Alfred Beit, Adolf Goerz, Lord Rothschild, Ernest Oppenheimer, Julius Wernher, E.A. Lippert and S. Neumann had turned gold mining in South Africa into one of the most lucrative undertakings in the whole world and, by the end of the First World War, South Africa's Jewish community, in terms of per capita income, had become the wealthiest on earth, which they probably still are. At the time Weizmann and Smuts met, the latter was a member of the British War Cabinet in London, and Weizmann sought his influence in British political circles to obtain the assurances of the Balfour Declaration, the planning of which Smuts is believed to have taken an active part in. Indeed, the two men frequently counselled each other on how to shape the destinies of their respective nations. They remained very close friends until Smuts died in 1950. In 1947, Smuts wrote: "I am a South African European proud of our heritage and proud of the clean European society we have built up, which I am determined not to see lost in the black pool of Africa". This statement showed Smuts's determination to work for an exclusively white society in South Africa, composed of Boers, Jews and Britons, the common chord he and Weizmann had struck. When Smuts died, the acting Prime Minister of Israel, Joseph Sprinzak, declared: "General Smuts is written on the map of Israel and in the heart of our nation." On 18 March, 1952, two years after his death, Israel, to his honour, formally dedicated Smuts Forest in the Judean hills, overlooking the Weizmann Forest.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is quite clear why the British supported the Zionists and dumped the Palestinian Arabs whom they had promised independence. It is also quite clear why they handled Jewish extremist agitation for the creation of Israel with kid gloves. Although the British did not condone Jewish terrorist activities, they did not take adequate measures to deal with them. For instance, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden was shot dead in a Jerusalem street in broad daylight in 1948, and those who shot him got away. On the other hand, in their handling of Boer extremists such as Hertzog, Verwoerd or Vorster, outspokenly anti-

A Brief Historical Background

British admirers of Nazi Germany, the British took care not to antagonize the Afrikaners as a race so that the Afrikaners would continue to be members of the British Commonwealth. Thus known or arrested members of Ossewabrandwag were merely detained, and not prosecuted as they should have been for belonging to an illegal organization.

The Israelis deny that Zionism is founded on racism despite the overwhelming evidence to prove the contrary. The Boers, on the other hand, openly admit that racism is the basis of all legislation regarding the status of all non-white peoples of South Africa, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the total population, more than seventy percent. But, they try to put a sugar coat on this by arguing that racism in South Africa is absolutely necessary, if the various racial groups in the country are to live at peace with each other. It is in the interests of racial harmony that the various racial groups be kept apart, each to develop in accordance with its own customs, traditions or cultural values. But Dr. D.F. Malan, the principal architect of apartheid declared in 1948 when the Nationalist party which he led came to power:

“The choice before us is one of these two divergent courses: either that of integration, which would in the long run amount to national suicide on the part of the whites; or that of apartheid, which professes to safeguard the future of every race . . . the fundamental guiding principle of National Party Policy is preserving and safeguarding the white race.”

Whatever the Israelis may say about Zionism not being racial, the world today holds that Zionism and apartheid are closely related ideologies, and the natural basis of the kinship between them is racism as was recognized by Hendrick Verwoerd, the virulently racist Prime Minister of South Africa, who in 1961 noted:

“(Jews) took Israel from the Arabs after the Arabs had lived there for a thousand years. In that I agree with them. Israel, like South Africa, is an apartheid state.”

At a memorial service for Verwoerd following his assassination in Cape Town in 1966, the Chief Rabbi had this to say about Verwoerd: “a man of sincerity and deep integrity . . . a moral con-

A Brief Historical Background

science underlay his policies: he was the first man to give apartheid a moral ground.”

But, however resentful people may be about the existence of Israel, it must be borne in mind that the drive towards the creation of the Jewish state was part and parcel of the spirit of nationalism and romanticism prevalent in Europe, particularly at the time Theodor Herzl wrote his ‘Jewish State’. The emergence of national states in Europe towards the end of the nineteenth century and early at the beginning of the twentieth century engendered in the Jews of Europe a sense of insecurity and isolation, discriminated against as they were in virtually every state. They, therefore, began looking for a place they could call their home and thus do away with dependence on other people. Such a home, they concluded, they could only set up in the land of their nearly forgotten forefathers, Palestine. They attributed the discrimination and persecution that they suffered in Europe to the fact that they lacked a home of their own. Zionism gave fresh impetus to the Jewish search for a national home.

At the time the Jews began to arrive in Palestine, as arranged for them by the British Government of the time according to the Balfour Declaration, Palestine was, as we have seen, inhabited mainly by Arabs who were Christian and Moslem, as, indeed, they still are today. There is a tendency in Africa to think that all Palestinians are Moslem. This is not so. The Arabs had fought side by side with the British during the First World War against the Turks who had occupied Palestine and who were allies of Germany. The Arabs had made a vital contribution towards the British war effort and, in recognition of this, the British had promised them independence when the war was over. At the time, there had been a marked upsurge in Arab nationalism throughout the Middle East, and a number of Arab states had attained independence. Some of these states were Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. The Palestinians, had no wish to lag behind their neighbours who were also related to them by race. They, therefore, looked forward to the independence the British had promised them. But the British found themselves caught up between two opposing camps, the Zionist Jews on the one hand, and nationalist Palestinians on the other, both looking

A Brief Historical Background

for a national home in the same place, but with this difference. The Jews came from outside, whereas the Arabs were on the spot.

The Jews had learnt one thing in Europe about the creation of national states. They had seen how unscrupulous and ruthless the Italian nationalists, for instance, had been in seeking and realizing the unification of their country (Machiavellianism) and eliminating Austrian domination. They had witnessed the supplantation of Austria by Prussia in the struggle by the two for German leadership which Prussia won, led by Otto von Bismarck who often employed means that were calculatedly unscrupulous and ruthless. They had also seen the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Turkish empires by nationalists in the Balkans, which resulted in the new national states of Yugoslavia, Greece, Bulgaria and Rumania. Those who took part in the campaigns for these states did not appear to have any mental qualms about what they did, like the murder of the Austrian crown prince at Sarajevo, as long as whatever they did contributed towards the realization of their national goals. Having witnessed all these, the Jews resolved on setting up their own national home in Palestine in similar fashion to what they had seen the Europeans do. Hence the use of terror, even if this led to world condemnation. Had not the world condemned the murder at Sarajevo and, had it not led to World War One? Did those Slavs, in the end, not realize their national goals?

Europe had rejected the Jews in spite of their enviable contribution to its civilization. For had they not produced the Mendelssohns, the Disraelis, Freud and Einstein, to name only a few? The devastating experiences of the Second World War convinced them that the solution to their problems lay in their having a national home of their own. This, they were resolved, they would bring about whether anybody agreed with them or not — the spirit that has guided the Jews in Israel to the present moment. But they have not been altogether successful, for Arab resistance has dogged every move they have made ever since they first landed in Palestine.

There is this distinction to make between European and Jewish nationalism of the age under consideration. European nationalism sprang up from amongst ethnically homogeneous peoples, long settled in traditionally accepted territories as national homelands of the peoples concerned, often with clearly defined borders. Jewish

*A Brief Historical Background**

nationalism sprang up from amongst a people in exile, as a reaction to racial oppression in foreign lands, which led to Jews, as it were, retracing their steps to a land they knew little or nothing about, a land they had forgotten about until Europe rejected them. Europe was going through a period of *risorgimento* (resurrection) or national re-awakening after many years of confusion brought about by foreign domination or imperialism in which the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires played leading roles. It was a period of national re-awakening, somewhat similar to what is happening today in certain parts of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe where nationalists are challenging Moscow's authority in order to re-discover their lost or dominated identity in such places as the Baltic states, Armenia (the dispute over Nagorno Karabach with neighbouring Azerbaijan being an indication of this spirit of nationalism), Poland, Hungary, etc. In the ensuing struggles between imperialists and nationalists, Jews were often used as pawns because of their vulnerability as a stateless minority. After 1945, the Jews were firmly resolved not to suffer thus any more.

Nor did the Boers remain unaffected by the changes taking place in Europe in the wake of the spirit of national *risorgimento* of the time under consideration. They too dreamed of establishing a national home of their own to ward off the humiliation and indignities of British imperialism, especially after the Great Trek. They never abandoned this even after suffering defeat at the hands of the British in the Great Boer War of 1899. But Boer or Afrikaner nationalism, like Jewish nationalism, sprouted among people who had nothing to do with it, the Africans. In time, they were to rise up against it because it could only grow and flourish at their expense.

Almost simultaneously with the arrival of the Jews in Palestine, there was a marked upsurge in Arab nationalism, sharpened by promises of independence made to the Arabs by the British after the First World War ended. But the British did not depart immediately after the war. They stayed on a little longer, for the Middle East had become more attractive following the discovery of oil around the Persian Gulf. A huge oil pipe had snaked its way across the desert all the way from Mesopotamia (Iraq) to the port city of Haifa which, as a result, became a very important oil port, and

A Brief Historical Background

ships from many parts of the world called there. In addition, there was the all-important sea route to the Far East and Australia through the Suez Canal, which Britain had no intention to abandon. There was no doubt the Jews too had their eyes on the lucrative oil trade and other economic ventures of the area, as they began to arrive, at first in trickles then in large numbers. The Arabs, in the meantime, stepped up their demands for independence. Clearly, dark clouds loomed over the area, for Arab and Jewish national interests were bound to clash.

The discovery of gold on the Rand in South Africa in 1886 and the resultant rush for quick money phenomenally transformed the economy of the Boer Republic of the Transvaal and, in time, that of South Africa as a whole, from mainly agricultural to diversified industrial pursuits. Businessmen from mainly Western Europe and the United States of America came to the Transvaal in search of money and wealth which gold mining offered and set up or invested large sums of money in new industries that were centred on Johannesburg which rapidly grew into a modern, bustling city. But the Boer Government of the Transvaal, led by Paul Kruger as president, denied the money-seekers the franchise and therefore citizenship of the Republic. Try, as they would, to change or influence Kruger's stand on this crucial issue one way or another, the British Government, who administered two provinces of South Africa at the time, the Cape and Natal, failed. The agitation for the franchise by the non-Boer whites or uitlanders (foreigners), who were predominantly British and the demands made on the Government of the Transvaal by the British Government on their behalf, grew in intensity and, eventually, as we have seen, led to war which the British won militarily, but which, politically, ended in victory for the Boers; for the British handed the administration of the Union of South Africa over to them. Still intent on setting up an Afrikaner republic outside the British Empire, the Boers quickly settled down to working out measures to secure the future for themselves by staunchly opposing anything that in any way suggested advancement for the African population and, after 1948, when the Nationalists were in power, adopted separate racial development or apartheid as a state policy and national philosophy. As in Palestine among the Arabs, there was at this time a very strong feeling of national-

A Brief Historical Background

ism among the Africans of South Africa which had expressed itself in 1912 in the founding of the first ever black political organization, the African National Congress, through which the Africans, hitherto unheard as a united racial group, were to air their views about the political, social and economic developments in South Africa, particularly those affecting them, in the face of so much racial oppression by the Government, with almost absolute impunity.

Initially, the African nationalists intended to air their grievances and to resist racial oppression by peaceful means, believing that, among the white men they dealt with, there was sufficient goodwill that would make it possible for them to receive some consideration or sympathy. Alas, this was not to be. The Boers were inexorably committed to promoting their group interests at the expense of the black man. Nothing would move them.

The futility of the methods adopted by the African National Congress to fight racial oppression was brought home to the understanding of African nationalists when the Government of the Boer Nationalists, led by Dr. D.F. Malan, came to power in 1948. Apartheid and racial discrimination in virtually all spheres of life against blacks and in favour of whites, were legalized. The Nationalists rushed through Parliament, in which blacks had no representation at all, several harsh pieces of legislation to enforce racialism and the persecution of the black man, which resulted from that. The Africans or non-whites were deprived of all political rights and had no say whatsoever in all that concerned the economy of the country other than their ability to provide labour. Education for Africans was washed of all that the world at large regarded as useful or beneficial and reduced to something only good enough for slaves; for in the words of Dr. Verwoerd, there was no place for Africans in Boer-dominated South Africa, "above the level of certain forms of labour." The white man, who constituted barely 30 percent of the total population of South Africa, allocated to himself 87 percent of all valuable or arable land and pushed the black man into the remaining 13 percent made up of unproductive land that scarcely sustained any life at all, or 'native reserves'. The Government also imposed a system of migratory labour between the reserves and the cities or towns, by which those Africans that were born in the cities or towns, worked there or could find em-

A Brief Historical Background

ployment, if they were in possession of valid passes, were allowed in the cities or towns, and only as long as their labour was needed. This resulted in the breaking up of families and a fall in morality among Africans. The African thus became a stranger in his own country. Africans whose presence in the cities or towns was deemed by the white man as undesirable, usually those without valid passes or unemployed, were forcibly 'repatriated' to the reserves or sent to farm prisons where they toiled under conditions of slavery. They were accommodated in structures that animals would feel uncomfortable in, were often beaten up for trivial offences, were poorly clothed and fed. Dr. W.W.M. Eiselen, Secretary of the Department of Bantu Administration and Development in Dr. Verwoerd's Government once said:

' "All the Bantu have their permanent homes in the Reserves and their entry into the other areas and into the urban areas is merely of a temporary nature and for economic reasons. In other words, they are admitted as work-seekers, not as settlers;" ' (Nelson Mandela — NO EASY WALK TO FREEDOM, Heinemann, London, 1965, p 67).

Dr. Eiselen's statement contrasts sharply with the Freedom Charter drawn up by the African National Congress and adopted at the Congress of the People at Kliptown, Johannesburg, on 25 and 26 June, 1955, which, among many other things, stated: "South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white." Certain critics of the African National Congress thought this statement revealed naivety on the part of the African nationalists. For, how does a man wrest a meal from the hands of his oppressor and, later, invite the oppressor to share the meal with him? However, the Freedom Charter reveals, above everything else, the noble principles of humanity that have motivated African freedom struggles and on the basis of which the African has no desire to exchange positions with the oppressor when freedom is won.

In the face of so much negative legislation, often enforced by brutal armed force, and after the failure of the 1952 Defiance Campaign against six selected apartheid laws, which led to 8 500 volunteers being jailed, it dawned on the African nationalists that time had come they tried something else, which might include the use of force. The Sharpeville massacre of 1960 of sixty-nine African

A Brief Historical Background

demonstrators by South Africa police who opened fire on a peacefully assembled crowd protesting against the pass laws and the subsequent banning, by the Government, of the Pan African Congress of South Africa, who were behind the Sharpeville demonstration, as well as the African National Congress itself, despite the peaceful manner in which the two organizations conducted themselves, left the African nationalist in no doubt that they had to meet violence with violence but even then, they were reluctant to commit themselves to wholesale violence.

Thus was born the Umkonto we Sizwe (spear of the nation), which was heralded by a few acts of sabotage in selected areas of South Africa in December, 1961. The African nationalists had come to the conclusion that they should pay the white man back in his own coin, having tried all peaceful methods of bringing about change in South Africa, to no avail. The Government, by contrast, became more and more brutally repressive, as was demonstrated by Sharpeville. When he was committed to court to stand trial on two charges: inciting Africans to strike (the Stay at Home of March, 1961) and leaving South Africa without a valid travel document, the trial which curiously took place in an old synagogue in Pretoria, converted into a courtroom, Nelson Mandela, in a statement to the court, warned the South African Government:

“Government violence can do only one thing and that is to breed counter-violence. We have warned repeatedly that the Government, by resorting continually to violence, will breed, in this country, counter-violence among the people, till ultimately, if there is no dawning of sanity on the part of the Government — ultimately, the dispute between the Government and my people will finish up by being settled in violence and by force.” (op. cit. p. 155).

Even after violence had been decided upon, it was to be of a limited nature and the spilling of human blood was to be avoided, as far as was possible. Government response to this made all-out armed struggle inevitable. The struggle that ensued still rages without letup.

At first, Government regarded South Africa's borders with neighbouring countries unbreachable. At the time, all neighbouring countries were Portuguese or British colonies. The Government

A Brief Historical Background

also thought that the internal defences of the country were impenetrable. But, following independence in all neighbouring countries, South Africa's borders became porous and its internal defences brittle. The result was guerrilla activity by the forces of African national liberation on a scale unheard of hitherto. This, plus strikes, demonstrations, riots and countless other forms of mass protest as well as pressure from the international community, opened a few cracks in the apartheid structure, and these cracks widen with every day that passes. With the Namibian independence now only a matter of a few months, the end for apartheid is certainly in sight.

Thus, like the Jews on the Arabs, the Boers vented their anger on people, the Africans, who had nothing to do with their miserable past, which was totally without justification, for the Jews suffered persecution at the hands of people in Europe, and not at the hands of Arabs in Palestine. Likewise, the Boers were persecuted by the British, and not by the African people of South Africa. That is to say that what the Israelis and the Afrikaners, essentially extraneous forces of conquest and occupation in the areas they hold, Palestine and South Africa, stand for today as in the past, has no moral justification whatsoever. Confrontation between the Jews and Palestinian Arabs was inevitable, just as it was between the Boers and African people of South Africa. Israelis hold Palestine by force of arms, just as Afrikaners hold South Africa by force of arms. The whole world condemns this because it is wrong, but neither the Israelis nor the Afrikaners are prepared to listen although they realize that what they do to local people in these parts of the world, has no moral justification at all. Hence the fiercely armed troops they deploy everywhere in Palestine and South Africa to hide their sense of guilt which breeds insecurity. For nothing is more insecure than wrong or evil. This is the reason why wrong or evil, wherever it holds sway, it surrounds itself with massive armed force which it increases at the slightest sign of danger, which is oftener than not more imagined than real.

Both Palestine and South Africa are big moral issues. This is the reason why the whole world feels concerned. Over the past forty years or so, no two issues have engaged the attention of the United Nations as much as the questions of Palestine and South Africa

A Brief Historical Background

have. A mishandling of the two could endanger world peace and security. Therefore, a way to settle them must be found in the interests of mankind as a whole.

The people of Palestine have never acquiesced in the expropriation of their land by Zionist Israel; nor have the African people of South Africa accepted or submitted to the plunder of their lands by apartheid South Africa, which every day of their lives means intolerable humiliation, harassment, beatings, torture and death itself. Both the Palestinian Arabs and the black people of South Africa have been resisting these forces of occupation, the brain-child of exploitative imperialism as well as racism, and their fight grows in intensity with every day that ends. The enemy, perhaps without realizing it, has been retreating all the time, while the Palestinian and black South African forces of national liberation have been gaining ground, for they have been fighting for that which is morally defensible, namely freedom and human dignity. That is to say, theirs is a morally just cause. They, surely, must defeat that which is wrong or morally indefensible. In other words, their struggles can never be in vain, as is borne out by history and current events in both Palestine and South Africa. These struggles seek to remove that which is wrong or evil and, therefore, can never fail; for wrong or evil has no right to exist.

It follows, therefore, that just as the Italian nationalists triumphed over Austrian oppressive domination; the Balkan states over Ottoman Turkish imperialism; human decency over Nazism, so too will the Palestinian Arabs and the black people of South Africa triumph over the Zionist and apartheid tyranny. The struggles may be long and arduous, but victory for the Palestinian and black South African peoples is certain. Current developments in both Palestine and South Africa point to this. South Africa erupted in 1984; Palestine in 1987.

The pages that follow attempt to throw some light on the significance of the struggle by the Palestinian people (Intifada) and that by the black people of South Africa against the twin evils of Zionism and apartheid.

Two

ISRAEL-SOUTH AFRICA VERSUS THE AFRO-ARAB WORLD

The question of Palestine is, or should be, central in the national life of every Arab state, just as the question of Southern Africa is, or should be, central in the national affairs of every African state. But several Arab states are also African. It follows, therefore, that the two questions, namely Palestine and Southern Africa are, or should be, common to both worlds, the Arab and the African.

Both Palestine and Southern Africa are occupied by forces of imperialism and exploitative capitalism and are subjected to brutal, repressive domination. It behoves every self-respecting Arab or African nation to see that this ends, for what is happening in Palestine and South Africa today poses a challenge to the Afro-Arab world. Nay, it is a humiliating slap in the face of every individual member of this bloc that must hurt his or her pride. Today, the peoples of the Arab nation and of Africa stand up against two of some of the most obnoxious expressions of racial arrogance mankind has ever known, represented by Zionist Israel and apartheid South Africa. Both Israel and South Africa, as they are known today, came on the world scene in 1948, for the express purpose of dispossessing the Afro-Arab world and reducing its peoples to positions of rightless servility. Nor did they come into being by chance. They were both imposed by British imperialism, as we have seen, to maintain a political and economic stranglehold on the Middle East and Southern Africa, in the interests of the West

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

European imperialism on the continent of Africa was put on the retreat during the first quarter of this century when the people of Egypt proclaimed their country a republic in 1922, after shaking off British domination. The fight for independence and freedom gained momentum after the Second World War when several Arab states were born. They were soon followed by Ghana in black Africa. Then, a few years later in 1960, France granted independence to most of her African colonies. By 1970, the face of Africa had changed to such an extent that of dominated Africa, apart from the tiny French enclave of Djibouti on the Red Sea, only the Portuguese possessions, Rhodesia, South-West Africa (Namibia) and South Africa proper remained. These developments caused a lot of disquiet and anxiety in the unliberated parts of the continent where white people, in complete defiance of the spirit of nationalism throughout the continent, dug in to defend what they believed was theirs. Thus the Portuguese, Rhodesians and Afrikaners had ganged up to challenge African nationalism to which they also vowed never to yield. Likewise, the Jews in Palestine, ignoring the very strong current of Arab nationalism that was sweeping the Middle East, had created the state of Israel.

Following independence over most of Africa between 1957 and 1970 Israel, unlike South Africa which, having been rejected almost everywhere on the continent of Africa adopted a bellicose stance, sought and established diplomatic relations with many of the new nations of Africa, in some cases through the mediation of the United States, Britain or France. She signed agreements with several of these African nations, by which she gave economic, technological and military assistance to them, mainly in the form of agricultural or farming technicians and instructors she provided to assist in the modernization of agriculture in the countries concerned as well as the provision of limited supplies of arms and the training of military or air force personnel.

Israel also found several of these states useful as markets for her manufactures and, especially, military hardware the exports of which have earned her some notoriety, particularly to trouble spots in the Third World. Israeli arms have over the years found their way to the horn of Africa, South Africa, the Persian Gulf in support of Iran against Iraq, Afghanistan, Taiwan, Nicaragua in sup-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

port of the Somoza dictatorship, El Salvador and all over Latin America in support of the various military dictatorships there, etc.

A number of African states, for a while, spoke very well of the Israeli assistance, from which obviously they thought they benefited, and the donor country appeared to have earned herself a very good name among these states. For a while, it looked as if Israel had befriended the new and emergent states of Africa, a most welcome compensation to her for the rebuff she had received in the Arab world which had refused to have anything to do with her. Was it a case of wolves in sheep skins or window-dressing?

Israel, as became manifest later, was too committed to South Africa to seriously befriend emergent Africa. At times, South Africa did view with some concern Israeli arms shipments to, particularly, Idi Amin's Uganda whose head of state was regarded in Pretoria as both capricious and dangerous. But the Israelis were there to see that Uganda posed no threat to South Africa.

"As for the Israeli involvement (in the coup that ousted Milton Obote) there was a large Israeli presence in Uganda after the coup and, later, the former head of the Israeli military mission, Colonel Baruch Bar-Lev, admitted in the New York Times of 17 July 1976 that he had assisted Amin to overthrow Obote. (It transpired that he had been seen the day before the coup with Amin at Entebbe Airport.) Amin, of course, had always had close relations with the Israelis, ever since he had assisted them, on Obote's orders, in the north of Uganda in their operations against Sudan."

This is by Princess Elizabeth of Toro, who served as Roving Ambassador and Foreign Minister in the Government of Idi Amin in Uganda, in her autobiography, *AFRICAN PRINCESS* (Spectrum Books, Ibadan, 1983, p.121.)

On Israeli meddling in African affairs, Princess Elizabeth has this to say:

"Now, up until that time, relations between anti-Israeli Libya and pro-Israeli Uganda had been very bad. Britain and Israel were strong allies.

It was during my mission to the UN with the Ugandan delegation including Wanume Kibedi, that Amin spoke out for dialogue with South Africa, in defiance of the OAU and those

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

'floating' African nations who were only secretly supporting dialogue. While we were there, a PLO representative came up to me and pointed out that our pro-Israeli policy was all very well, but was I aware that, under Balfour, the British had offered Uganda to the Jews as a place of settlement, and asked me what I thought we would have done if the Jews had not said they preferred to go back to Palestine instead." (Op. cit. p. 130.)"

All this took place before Amin broke with Israel, of course. But the Israelis took advantage of their presence in Uganda, as, indeed, they did elsewhere in Africa, not only to further their own interests, but to protect those of South Africa as well. The difference between South Africa's attitude towards Africa and Israel's was that, whereas the Boers' policies were open and straightforward, Israel's policies tended to be secretive and furtive. That is to say that Africans found South Africa easier to handle than Israel, which is the case even now. This, perhaps, explains why the liberation struggle in South Africa appears to be more advanced than the Palestinian one.

While Israel was out in Africa to make friends, South Africa would rather sabotage whatever good came Africa's way as a result of independence than do anything to promote that good. For a prosperous black Africa spelt doom to her. She, therefore, remained totally malevolent as Israel won many a friend on the continent. In time, South Africa became the rallying point for all anti-Africa or neo-colonialist elements such as the Congo mercenaries, many of whom were recruited from South Africa where they also trained in anti-African activities, and other elements that sought to render African independence fruitless in order to turn the clock back and to prove South Africa's often repeated argument that Africa needs the continued presence of the white man, if independence is to mean anything to her and that Communism will use African independence as a smoke-screen to gain a foothold on the continent, to the detriment of everything Europeans have done for the good of Africa. This is the reason why South Africa regards all dedicated African nationalists as communist agitators who, once in power, will hand over their countries to the communists, a situation fraught with danger for the entire continent. Communism, the

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

Afrikaners argue further, has enslaved the peoples of Eastern Europe by setting up dictatorial or tyrannical regimes such as the ones in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, which in 1956 and 1968 crushed popular freedom movements, with the help of Russia, the mentor and mainstay of all communist states. Communism is so oppressive that even the East Europeans cannot stand it any longer, which explains the hundreds of thousands of people in East Germany and Poland fleeing these countries for the West and the nationalist freedom movements in Hungary, Poland and the Baltic states. Communism, the Afrikaners believe, contributed in no small measure to the tragedy of the Congo where it had helped in the seizure of power by agitators and fanatics such as Patrice Lumumba and his supporters, who were all in the pay of Moscow.

Likewise, the Israelis regard all committed or militant Arab nationalists as communists and tools of Moscow which has been seeking to assert itself in the Middle East at the expense of what they call the "free world".

However, the Israelis, in their usual furtive way, were careful not to openly say or do anything that was likely to wound black African susceptibilities. Above all, the Israelis dreaded the possibility of a linkup between Arabs and Africans against them. They were very careful, therefore, not to do anything that might suggest that they supported South Africa. Indeed, at the time, the Israelis had created an atmosphere that suggested that there was not much in common between Tel Aviv and Pretoria; so much so that certain Afrikaner diehard nationalists tended to associate Jews in South Africa with communist sympathisers of black African nationalists, for, at that time in South Africa, many white socialists or trade unionists or liberals of one kind or another, who cooperated or sympathised with black nationalists or workers, were of Jewish stock, as were many white members of the Communist Party of South Africa. Moreover, had not Karl Marx been a Jew?

The Israelis had, in the meantime, been listening to the Afro-Arab choruses of their condemnation of South Africa at the United Nations and other international fora, in which many nations from other parts of the world, particularly Asia and Latin America joined. They did not want the same to happen to themselves.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

This partly explains why Israel almost outdid the European nations and the United States in offering aid to black Africa, by which she sought to keep Africans contented and well away from the Arabs; or aid with strings attached, lest the Arabs should influence them, a situation that would place the Jewish state in the same boat as South Africa. However, this did not take long to occur. The occasion was the six-day war of 1967 in which Egypt, a leading Arab nation and, at the same time, one of the most influential African nations, took part against Israel and lost territory. Gamal Abdel Nasser, the President of Egypt at the time, was a well-respected pan-Africanist who had played a leading role in the founding of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement. He quickly won the sympathy and support of most black African nations in Egypt's and, by extension, Arab condemnation of Israeli aggression against the Arab nation. Moreover, leading black African nations such as Nigeria and Guinea, had large muslim communities and, on religious grounds, they sympathized with the Arabs. So, when the six-day war was debated by the United Nations, support for the Arab world by most African nations was total. Israel openly began, slowly, to drift towards South Africa, the only other nation without friends in the Third World. The break with black Africa was complete following the October or Yom Kippur War of 1973, when by a resolution of the Organization of African Unity, all African states broke off diplomatic relations with Israel, which finally forced the Jewish state to abandon all pretence about her relations with black Africa and to openly embrace South Africa which, itself, on the continent of Africa was supported only by Portugal, Rhodesia and Malawi, the last named being the only black African state with diplomatic ties with Pretoria. On the world scene, this group had the United States of America, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy and Japan as their main backers. Henceforth, Israel and South Africa were to co-operate, openly, as allies against what became their common enemy, the Afro-Arab world, although many Israeli diplomats maintained that their country had no quarrel with black Africa, which, they said, had been manipulated to join the Middle East conflict by the Arabs who deliberately started the 1973 war to win African sympathy. Israel, therefore, they added, regarded the rift between herself and black Africa as unfortunate.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

From then on, Israel was to be South Africa's partner in seeking Africa's ruin in every way possible, especially economic and political. They started off by exchanging information on their respective regions. Israel fed South Africa with information on the Middle East and Arab North Africa, while South Africa furnished the Israelis with information on Southern Africa. Both learnt about the rest of Africa from their European allies, namely the British, the French and the Portuguese.

When black African nationalists in the Portuguese colonies, in Rhodesia and Namibia launched the wars of national liberation between 1963 and 1970, reports that Israelis were helping in the training of special Portuguese, Rhodesian and South African anti-guerrilla commando units were not uncommon. Both Israel and South Africa had outlawed political organisations run by local people, the Palestine Liberation Organisation, in the case of the former, the African National Congress and Pan African Congress, in the case of the latter. They also adamantly refused to involve themselves in any dialogue for peaceful settlement of differences between themselves and liberation organizations, leaving violent confrontation as the only way out, as the world is witnessing. Co-operation between Israel and South Africa in all spheres of life, at national as well as individual levels increased remarkably. For instance, when South African black nationalist leaders, Nelson Mandela and others, were tried for staging violent revolution in 1964 (the Rivonia trial), it was Percy Yutar, President of the Johannesburg United Hebrew Congregation, who prosecuted. The choice of the man was not by chance. Yutar was, in 1968, appointed Attorney General of the Orange Free State, home of extreme Afrikaner nationalism. Writing about the role played by Yutar during the 1976 protests and riots by South African black school children, against the use of Afrikaans as medium of instruction in their schools, which led to the Soweto massacre of several hundreds of the school children, Denis Herbstein has this to say:

“Dr. Yutar, though not an Afrikaner (he is a leading member of the Jewish community) had played a vital role in eliminating political activists in South Africa, particularly as prosecutor in the Rivonia trial a decade before; now his role was to protect the police and Government officials. When a witness

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

criticised Bantu Education inspectors for their handling of the Afrikaans language issue, Dr. Yutar intervened: 'I must draw your attention to the fact that they were only doing their duty.' On another occasion, when a priest thought that ninety-two deaths at the hands of the police was 'very high, in this civilized world, so called', Dr. Yutar came back quickly with, 'Many more than ninety-two have been killed in rioting in Ireland, surely . . . ?' (Denis Herbstein — WHITE MAN, WE WANT TO TALK TO YOU, Pelican, London, 1978, p. 221)

South Africa sent hundreds of her white young men to Israel to undergo training in desert warfare tactics. On their return home, these young men were sent to fight against the guerrillas of the South West African Peoples Organisation (SWAPO) in Namibia which is mostly desert. Israelis trained with South Africans in bush warfare in preparation for assignments in Lebanon or Syria, should that become necessary, or, indeed, in Africa itself, should need arise, as it did in 1976 when the Israelis sent commandos to rescue Jews held hostage in a plane hijack at Entebbe, Uganda. Nor were Israeli arms or military advisers in Southern Africa something unheard of. Israel always denied that she was in any way involved in the African wars, but there was sufficient evidence to prove the contrary.

Israel's friendly co-operation and intimate relations with South Africa culminated, as early as 1950, in the Israeli Prime Minister paying a state visit to South Africa, which was reciprocated three years later by South Africa's Prime Minister, Dr. D.F. Malan, becoming the first ever foreign head of government to visit the Jewish state. Diplomatic relations between the two were elevated to full ambassadorial level following the exchange of visits by their heads of government and economic co-operation was further strengthened, with South Africa exporting more raw materials such as uncut diamonds to Israel.

In 1985, the commercial balance between the two nations reached 225 million dollars. Israel bought from South Africa goods worth about 165 million dollars and sold to South Africa 65 million dollars worth of goods.

During the eighties, South Africa exported in excess of 100 million dollars worth of uncut diamonds a year, to Israel. Thus South

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

African diamonds that were mined with the sweat and blood of Africans, went to bolster up the economy of a hostile nation that, in return, exported arms such as the Uzi submachinegun and centurion tanks with which South African soldiers had been killing and maiming black people everywhere in the Southern African subregion. Another raw material of vital and strategic importance, which South Africa exports to Israel is uranium for use in the Dimona nuclear reactor. This means, therefore, that African uranium is used to aid Israel into becoming a nuclear power, adding to the dangers of nuclear warfare. Both Israel and South Africa, as has been stated already, refuse to join the 1968 international Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and, consequently, do not permit inspection of their nuclear plants by the International Atomic Energy Commission. But enough is known of nuclear capabilities of the two through the revelations made by an Israeli nuclear technician, Mordechai Vanunu, who had worked in the Dimona plant for ten years and who talked to the British *Sunday Times* in London about the details of Israel's nuclear build-up which the paper published in 1986 and which earned Vanunu an 18-year jail sentence. Vanunu also revealed that South African technicians were working at the Israeli nuclear plant. In September, 1979, Israel and South Africa jointly exploded a nuclear device over the South Atlantic. Israel, with the expertise acquired from the United States, has been aiding South Africa's nuclear tests and equipping her army with missiles such as the Jericho, which are capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The two have a joint naval project to develop nuclear submarines which are designed by Israeli engineers and built in South Africa. Israel, in addition, provides South Africa with patrol and missile boats, Gabriel sea-to-sea missiles, as well as training, in Israel, for South African navy personnel. The air force, with which South Africa, threatens, intimidates and attacks neighbouring black African states, particularly those committed to African liberation in Southern Africa, the air force that has brought death and destruction to vast areas of Angola and Namibia, the air force that had been a thorn in the flesh of the Angolan peoples liberation forces until it was stopped by Cuban and Angolan forces during the fight for Cuito Cuanavale in 1987, which became the turning point in the fight for Namibian independence, is almost

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

a replica of the Israeli air force, using as it does, the same Mirage-3 jets and helicopters. The new South African jet fighter, the "Cheetah" which was unveiled in 1986, is almost identical with the Israeli Kfir-2 jet.

According to a report in the *Jerusalem Post* in November, 1987, South Africa had been recruiting Israeli engineers from the Lavi aircraft project, largely built with American technical knowhow and money, to whom she offered fabulous salaries of as much as 84 million dollars a year. Already, between 1 200 and 1 500 were working in South Africa's munitions factories.

The Americans were rather perturbed that the Lavi project technology should be transferred to South Africa in defiance of the 1977 UN arms embargo, to which they were a party. The United States Congressional Black Caucus at a meeting with Israeli Premier, Yitzhak Shamir, on 16 March, 1988, expressed their disapproval of the Israeli-South African connection vis-a-vis the Lavi project. They said: "Recalling the inhumanities of slavery in this country, having suffered the indignities of racial discrimination, Black Americans recognize and identify with those who are oppressed throughout the world. We, thus, feel a growing kinship with the Palestinians." Earlier, Congressman George Crockett had asked Mr. Shamir on his Government's brutal response to the Palestinian uprising and wanted to know when "the curfews, the closed military zones, the beatings, the house raids, the gunshots, the rubber bullets, the tear-gassing and mass deportations will end."

The October or Yom Kippur war, 1973, gave many a South African and Rhodesian young mercenary a golden opportunity to get involved in actual fighting on the side of Israel. Both South Africa and Rhodesia tried to deny this, but the very quick adoption, by their armed forces, of Israeli military tactics was proof enough that they had been there. One of these tactics was called "hot pursuit" which meant pursuing the enemy right into their sanctuaries and, once found, eliminated. Another was cross-border raids, used by the Israelis chiefly against Palestinian guerrillas based in neighbouring Arab states, particularly Lebanon. It was at this time that the Rhodesian Selous Scouts, South African Koevoet commandos and the Portuguese PIDE as well as other hit squads became so daring that they began hitting targets in their areas of operation with so

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

much precision that they became almost unstoppable. Thus the Selous scouts or their collaborators crossed into Zambia and assassinated two leading Zimbabwe nationalists, Herbert Chitepo and Jason Moyo, in Lusaka. Koevoet claimed many SWAPO victims in Namibia during the same period.

Meanwhile, African and Arab diplomats at the United Nations and other international fora were at one in condemning both Israel and South Africa as international outlaws who should have no friends anywhere because of what they did to people in the areas they held by sheer force of arms. The Afro-Arab group at the United Nations received massive support from the Third World and the Communist Bloc as well as from many nations in the Western World. Communist support for the Afro-Arab group of nations, almost automatically meant United States and other Western support for the Israeli-South African alliance, regardless of circumstances.

In the early seventies, some oil-rich Arab nations, notable among them Libya, decided to retaliate against American and West European support for Israel by using what was known as the "oil weapon", which meant cutting off oil supplies to the United States and to European nations that supported Israel or selling it to them at rates higher than those applicable elsewhere, in order to force them to change their attitudes. At the same time, they stepped up their efforts to give support to the Palestinians, some of whom had, themselves, resorted to attacking Israeli interests and those of their European or American backers, which included the hijacking of planes or ships. These acts were at once condemned everywhere in the West as barbaric and unjustifiable, and those engaged in them as callous murderers and terrorists. There was at this time in Western Europe and the United States a tendency to brand anything Palestinian or Libyan as "terrorist". Palestinians or Libyans were often depicted as people devoid of human reason or feelings. Later, however, there was a reduction in incidents of plane hijacking or holding of hostages, following disapproval of these methods of struggle by most friends of the Palestinians both in Africa and elsewhere. At the same time, African nationalists in South Africa, Rhodesia, Namibia and the Portuguese colonies stepped up their guerrilla warfare. They too earned themselves the tag "ter-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

rorist", but they paid no attention to the implications of this as they recognized that the methods of struggle they employed were quite legitimate. Moreover, they felt that the enemy had no right whatsoever to instruct them how they should go about the task of liberating themselves.

A question many asked, particularly at the United Nations, where it was hotly debated, was: who should determine what was and what was not terrorism? Was it for the administrations in Israel and South Africa to say who was and who was not a terrorist? Palestinians and black South Africans alike, maintained that the presence of Zionist Israel in Palestine and that of apartheid South Africa in Southern Africa were, in themselves, acts of terrorism. It meant, therefore, that neither Israel nor South Africa had any right to refer to anybody seeking their removal as "terrorist", regardless of the methods that person or persons employed. Neither the Palestinians nor black South Africans took the West seriously on this score because when Israelis or South Africans shot and killed Palestinians or Africans in cold blood, it was not terrorism, but it was, the other way round, even when Palestinians or Africans killed in self defence. And, who was a terrorist leader, Menachem Begin or Yasser Arafat; Balthazar John Vorster or Nelson Mandela; Sam Nujoma or Pieter Botha? The world at large answers this question in the events taking place now in Palestine and Southern Africa. Israel and South Africa, supported by their friends in Western Europe and the United States of America, would like the rest of the world to believe that it is the Palestinian and African nationalists who are terrorists, but the world thinks otherwise. It is Israel and South Africa that are condemned by the international community for the acts of dehumanization and brutalization they commit against Palestinians and Africans such as: arbitrary arrest; detention or imprisonment without trial; suppression of unarmed demonstrations with tear-gas, rubber-bullets, dogs or whips; beatings; torture; excessive use of firearms against unarmed civilian populations and resultant mass murder; etc., etc. It is the Israelis and South Africans who stand accused, and not the Palestinian or African nationalists. Moreover, Menachem Begin did belong to a terrorist organization, the Irgun Zvai Leumi, so did Balthazar John Vorster to the Ossewabrandwag in support of Nazi Germany, a

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

regime that used terror against Jews whom it also wiped out in their millions for being Jews.

Some people wonder whether it is for the invader to determine what means the resister should employ to eject him in order to protect his people and property. When one considers how the Israelis and the Afrikaners made their way into Palestine and South Africa respectively, one cannot help concluding that the two, basically, are invaders and their presence where they are, is occupation. Invasion or occupation provokes resistance, unless that which is invaded or occupied is empty, and neither Palestine nor South Africa was empty when the Jews or Boers arrived. Under normal circumstances, one does not call a man fighting an intruder a terrorist. If anything, it is the intruder who should be called terrorist. The Israelis give so much vent to the argument that Palestine is the land of their biblical forefathers. But this is also true of the Arabs. So?

There has been, over the years, a lot of bickering at the United Nations over the correct definition of terrorism simply because the United States and their allies, in their defence of Israel and South Africa, would like the whole world to accept that whatever the Palestinians or black South Africans do in form of armed struggle cannot be legitimately resorted to by these peoples. At the same time, the United States and their allies, particularly Britain, France and West Germany, are reluctant to accept that the excessive and frequent use of firearms on unarmed civilian populations in Palestine by the Israelis and in South Africa by the Afrikaners; the flagrant violations, by Israelis and South Africans, of territorial and sovereign integrity of neighbouring states such as Lebanon, Syria and Iraq, the last named where Israeli planes bombed and blasted out of existence a nuclear reactor station built with French assistance in 1981 or Botswana, Swaziland, Angola, Mozambique, etc., in pursuit of what is often termed "terrorists"; the shooting down and cold-blooded killing of Palestinian and black South African unarmed demonstrators or protestors, not only do they constitute terrorism of the worst type, but are barbaric beyond description as well. It has often been implied in the arguments one comes across in the West aired in support of both Israel and South Africa that these acts could not possibly be termed "terrorism" because they are carried out by civilized peoples in order to maintain law and

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

order or to protect Christian or Western values. But terrorism is terrorism, regardless of who is engaged in it and for what reason. Man the world over is still horrified by Sobibor, Treblinka, Auschwitz, etc., regardless of whatever anyone might say in defence of these places of shame, the nadir of man's animality.

To stave off what appeared to be an ever-increasing wave of condemnation throughout the world and to ward off moves spear-headed by the Afro-Arab world to isolate them, both Israel and South Africa launched manoeuvres to win as many friends as they possibly could among Arab nations and on the continent of Africa and, in the process to try and wreck both the Arab League and the Organisation of African Unity. Thus South Africa formulated what they called "outward-looking" policy, the chief aim of which was to establish links with as many countries in Africa as possible, extending these to Arab nations at a later stage, should that become necessary. The then Prime Minister of South Africa, John Vorster, travelled to several parts of Africa, particularly former French colonies and particularly those experiencing economic difficulties of one kind or another, where, with promises of money or economic aid, he managed to win a few friends. Those who knew the policies pursued by these African nations and the men who led them, were not altogether surprised at Vorster's success. Consequently, as was to be expected, these nations adopted a lukewarm attitude towards the African liberation movement, particularly as it affected South Africa, or abstained from voting for resolutions condemning South Africa, at the United Nations, thereby dividing and weakening Africa's stand on apartheid and South Africa's racial policies, to the Afrikaners' greatest joy. Sometimes they even voted against such resolutions altogether, giving the Boers the respect they, certainly, did not deserve. On the other hand, certain Arab states, began to play in the hands of the enemy, notable Jordan which, according to a report in AFRICA magazine, issue No. 39 of November, 1974, sold arms to South Africa and Rhodesia through the intermediary of a Jordanian businessman called Munther Bilbeisi.

The deal was negotiated between King Hussein's personal friend and head of the Jordanian Air Force, Brigadier Aboud Hassan, and the head of the South African Defence Forces, Admiral H.H

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

Biermann. Altogether, Jordan sold 41 centurion tanks which, for the purpose of maintaining some secrecy, were described as "earth-moving tractors", 120 Aden cannon, 328 one thousand pound bombs, over 3 000 Sura rockets and over 400 000 rounds of 30mm ammunition. Initially, the deal was to include 31 British-built Hawker Hunter jet fighters, but on the day the contract to effect the deal was to be signed, on 21 July, 1974, "... President Anwar Sadat telephoned King Hussein to say that it was unthinkable that Arab jets, which had fought with honour against Israel, should now be used against Jordan's Third World brothers in the liberation movements in Southern Africa." (AFRICA No. 39, November, 1974). The aircraft part of the deal was subsequently abandoned.

Nor could it be argued that the Israelis or Jews had no hand in the deal which did much to weaken the Afro-Arab solidarity. The Jordanians must have known that South Africa would use the weapons to suppress black people in South Africa itself and intimidate black African states in the neighbourhood or pass them on to the Rhodesian white settlers to bolster their sagging morale. It is quite probable that some of the tanks and ammunition were among the weaponry South African troops took with them to Angola in 1975 to launch their abortive war of aggression there. Moreover, it must have been clear to the Jordanians that South Africa and Israel had joined hands to break the alliance between the Arab world and Africa, which had adopted a common stand against Israel and South Africa, as evidenced by the manner Arabs and black Africans debated the Middle East and South Africa at the United Nations. The aim of the enemy, whatever they did to fight back, was, of course, primarily to drive a wedge between Arabs and black Africans. That is to say that South Africa, in the arms deal with Jordan, which has just been alluded to, would be more inclined towards the wrecking of the Afro-Arab solidarity than towards the mere acquisition of arms. South Africa, of course knew, that sooner or later the black people of Africa would find out about the Jordanian arms shipments to the Boer Republic and, there was every likelihood, the two camps, i.e., the Arab world and black Africa, would soon be quarrelling.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

The enemy will always use weak and wavering members of the Afro-Arab Bloc thus, to sow seeds of discord and misunderstanding, to the enemy's own advantage.

In 1978, after many months of shuttle diplomacy, the United States, under the presidency of Mr. Jimmy Carter, managed to bring Egypt and Israel together to negotiate a peace treaty, as a way to end the Middle East conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbours. The negotiations, which were presided over by Mr. Carter himself, resulted in the Camp David Accord which rather than bring about peace between Israel and her Arab neighbours, led to more polarization between Israel and most of the Arab world as well as to a serious rift between Egypt and nearly all other Arab nations, perhaps, the very state of affairs Israel wanted to bring about or would be happy to see. Arab cohesion, there could be no doubt about that, was severely undermined.

Egypt was accused, by other Arab nations, of having betrayed the Arab cause by concluding what appeared to be a separate peace with Israel, by which the latter undertook to restore to her the occupied Sinai Peninsula at the expense of virtually all Arab demands which Egypt did not press as a condition for signing the Accord. The Arabs had demanded the return by Israel of all Arab territory seized during the six-day war of 1967, including the city of Jerusalem as well as guarantees for a Palestinian home on the West Bank and Gaza. But Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, even before the peace treaty was signed, defiantly shouted that there would never be a Palestinian state on either the West Bank or in Gaza and that Israel would never return to the pre-1967 borders.

Replying to Egyptian demands for the return of all Arab occupied territories, Mr. Begin is reported to have told Israeli Parliament, the Knesset:-

“Dr. Khalil (the Egyptian Prime Minister) Israel will never return to the pre-1967 lines. Secondly, Dr. Khalil, mark my words, united Jerusalem is the eternal capital of Israel. It will never be divided again. Thirdly, Dr. Khalil, in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, there will never be a Palestinian state.”
(Newsweek/April 2, 1979)

Critics of Mr. Sadat thought that in view of Israel having conceded nothing substantial to the Arab world, there was no basis

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

for the peace treaty, which the Egyptian leader signed nevertheless. It, certainly, looked as if Egypt wanted to see herself out of the Middle East conflict by signing a peace treaty that concerned only herself, on the one hand, and Israel on the other.

Reaction to Camp David in the Arab world was as expected. Egypt was roundly denounced and condemned. Several Arab nations cut off political and economic links with her. She was also expelled from the Arab League. Many believe that Camp David had something to do with Mr. Sadat's assassination two years later in 1981, as, indeed, the many and quite serious threats to his life made in several places in the wake of Camp David, would suggest. But in Egypt itself, according to reports, people greeted the Camp David Accord with jubilation, and Mr. Sadat received a hero's welcome on his return home from the United States. Nevertheless, there were dissenting voices, notable that of Foreign Minister, Muhammad Ibrahim Kamel, who resigned in protest.

As usual, the imperialist world were quick to draw their own dividing line between "moderates" and "hard-liners". Under the former heading were grouped such states as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia, while hard-liners were Syria, Iraq, Libya and Algeria, to name only some. Arab polarization was complete. The imperialist world, the principal backers of both Israel and South Africa, settled down to exploit the differences between these two groups, playing one group against the other (divide and rule) to their own and to the advantage of both Israel and South Africa.

A few years earlier, in similar fashion, the imperialist world had helped in causing a rift that split the Organization of African Unity into two — moderates and hard-liners — when, with their support and guidance, South Africa succeeded in establishing contacts with a number of African states, both black and Arab, with the result that, as in the case of the Arabs following Camp David, the hitherto unshaken solidarity among African nations was rendered porous and fragile. Consensus of opinion, unanimity or concerted action on matters that should be of common concern or interest, particularly the liberation of Southern Africa, became difficult, if not impossible, to achieve, as dissension and recrimination reigned.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

It was not by coincidence that rebel Rhodesian commandos, with the support of South Africa — in all probability that of Israel as well — felt so confident that between 1975 and 1979 they began carrying out cross-border raids into neighbouring African states, such as Mozambique, Botswana and Zambia, hitting targets almost at will.

At about the same time, Israel involved herself in the fighting between Christian Phalangists and muslims in Lebanon, after she had carried out many cross-border raids into Southern Lebanon to attack what she often described as “terrorist bases”, but which many observers believed were, in fact, Palestinian refugee camps. At first, Israel supplied arms to the Phalangists for whom, of course, they had no special liking. They supplied the arms in accordance with the French adage, “les ennemis de mes ennemis sont mes amis” (the enemies of my enemies are my friends). Later, Israel moved in with her troops and sophisticated weaponry to bring an end to what they said was the Palestinian terrorist threat in Beirut and surrounding areas. Bitter and sometimes savage fighting ensued between the Israeli invading force and Palestinian guerrillas and their allies that brought woe and death to Beirut, for centuries the paradise of the Middle East. The Israelis were, however, in the end, forced to withdraw by world opinion and the gallant resistance put up by the Palestinians and their allies. After they (the Israelis) had created a *cordon sanitaire* in Southern Lebanon and having wreaked death and havoc on large areas of Beirut and the vicinity, they pulled their troops across the border and returned home.

In Southern Africa, Rhodesian commandos managed to establish a reign of terror in many parts of Zimbabwe. Nationalist liberation movements with bases in neighbouring Mozambique and Zambia were infiltrated to such an extent that, temporarily, their efforts to give it back to the enemy were thrown into disarray. Amid the resultant confusion, disunity and antagonism that threatened to split the movements, many committed nationalist guerrillas were abducted and murdered. The enemy were to repeat this several years later when they murdered President Samora Machel of Mozambique on 19 October, 1986, by sabotaging his plane in which many other Mozambican nationalists also died and when they as-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World
sassinated Abu Jihad, Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) stalwart, on 16 April, 1988, in Tunis.

What was needed at this moment, i.e., between 1973 and 1980, above everything else in both the Arab and African worlds was vigilance and unwavering commitment to the struggle. Consultation to compare notes and to map out an all-embracing common strategy, was a dire necessity. The enemy were united, and their strategy, political, economic and military, indicated that they certainly understood who they were dealing with, which, undoubtedly, was the result of careful study, consultation and, above all, vigilance in their camp.

There is a divergence of opinion regarding whether or no time is ripe for black Africa to re-establish diplomatic relations with Israel, severed in 1973. But, even before the question was raised by anyone, some black African states, with the Cote d'Ivoire and Zaire in the lead, had done so. Perhaps, this fact in itself should not worry many people. What is interesting, however, is the fact that most, if not all, of the ten black African states that have re-established diplomatic ties with Israel so far, are the same states that played host to South Africa's Premier John Vorster or his ministers between 1972 and 1978 when the Afrikaner Republic, rebuffed and isolated, launched a campaign to win friends on the continent of Africa. One shade of opinion has it that so long as Israel continues to support South Africa and so long as she holds on to Arab land in the Middle East, refusing to end her occupation of the West Bank and Gaza and remains opposed to the creation of a home for the Palestinian people, there does not seem to be very much reason for the restoration of diplomatic ties by any African state. After all, this situation is the very reason why Africa broke with the Jewish state in 1973. However, those who have restored diplomatic ties with Israel argue that they could not be more Arab than the Arabs themselves. They point out that, much as they sympathize with the Arabs over the situation in the Middle East, they see no strong reason why they should perpetuate the rupture with Israel if Egypt, a leading Arab nation and one in whose support they broke with Jerusalem, has established diplomatic relations with the Jewish state. There is also the question of sovereignty. These nations believe that, as independent and sovereign states, they have the

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

right and power to decide who should or should not be their friends without any reference to anybody. They are motivated solely by national interests, the argument goes on. But their critics point out that there are group or bloc interests to think of in international relations, which often inhibit or restrain states from acting against the interests of groups or blocs to which they belong.

The ideal situation, of course, should be a total boycott of both Israel and South Africa by the entire Afro-Arab Bloc. Could it be that the enemy are more resolute or better organised?

There are indications, as we shall see later, that both Israel and South Africa, under pressure from most of the world — and the Afro-Arab Bloc have contributed in no small measure to that pressure — are cracking up. It would appear, therefore, that the ten nations of Africa — there may be more — who are on friendly terms with Israel once again, may have given up the fight when the enemy was about to collapse, despite the bragging in Jerusalem.

It has been suggested in some quarters that Israeli or Jewish offers of money and other benefits or promises of economic aid to certain African leaders played the trick. The conduct of certain African leaders over the years, certainly renders them suspect or amenable to furtive or backdoor dealings of this nature.

So far, there are ten African states with diplomatic relations with Israel, and only one with South Africa. Is this, perhaps, an indication that to Africa, Israel is more acceptable than South Africa? Or, does this suggest that Afro-Arab solidarity is not that solid after all?

Nor should the Palestinian or black South African forces of national liberation be oblivious of the enemy's ability to throw them off trail and into disarray. For instance, the enemy has the tendency to employ diversionary tactics, especially when under pressure. Both Israelis and South Africans have, time and again, tried to divert world attention from real issues in their countries to something else, often taking place with their connivance, in order to buy time. Thus the Israelis would like to foment or encourage trouble in areas outside Israel in order to reduce the pressure put on them or divert both Palestinian and world attention from what is happening inside Israel itself. South Africans have been encouraging anti government elements in neighbouring black states, such

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

as the Mozambican National Resistance rebels or MNR in Mozambique or UNITA in Angola in order to blunt the advance of the black South African forces of national liberation and reduce African national cohesion in the neighbourhood so that anti government guerrillas in South Africa will be deprived of sanctuaries in the neighbourhood. Enemy diversionary tactics are always proportional to pressure put on them by the forces of liberation or world opinion. Another tactic often employed by the enemy is to infiltrate liberation movements and encourage factionalism. In South Africa there has been bitter fratricidal fighting between supporters of the United Democratic Front (UDF) and those of the Inkatha Movement of Chief Gatsha Buthelezi. Factionalism has not been lacking within the ranks of the Palestine Liberation Organisation. The enemy will always exploit factional differences to their advantage.

To maintain factionalism, confronted by such a resolute, united and determined enemy, as the Israelis and Afrikaners are, is to commit national suicide. Many people, in the past, have sacrificed factional interests to national ones. For example, Chinese communist and national forces (the Kuomintang) in 1936 sank their factional differences to fight a common enemy, Japan, which had invaded their country. Likewise, the Rhodesian black nationalist groupings, the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) abandoned their differences to fight a common enemy, the Rhodesian white settler forces, and formed what they called the Patriotic Front which won them independence in 1980. The wisdom of this, some people say, cannot be overemphasized, just as the dangers of factionalism and disunity cannot be more manifest. Besides, factional disunity would appear baseless in the event of the enemy holding your country endlessly. Factional disunity helps the enemy's prolonged hold on a people's country, and the enemy will do everything in their power to see that it persists.

Those engaged in the struggles for national liberation, like the Palestinian Arabs and the black people of South Africa are, should learn from the enemy who are so united that not even the usually sensitive issues such as the support for Nazi Germany by certain Afrikaner nationalists would stop Israel from seeking the hand of

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

South Africa. It behoves Palestinian and black South African nationalists to do away with factional divisions and speak with one voice, at least until the enemy is beaten.

Common interests have brought the Israelis and Boers so close together that their behaviour regarding how they persecute the Palestinians and the non-white peoples of South Africa is almost uniform. Nearly all the indignities the Palestinians suffer at the hands of the Israelis are, almost to a letter, repeated by the Boers of South Africa on the non-white peoples there, so much so that today Zionism and apartheid are almost interchangeable. To the Palestinian Arabs and the black peoples of South Africa, there should, therefore, be no difference whether the enemy is Israeli or Boer.

The following is how the Israelis and the Boers of South Africa go about their common business or the most virulent expression of racial arrogance, reminiscent of Nazism.

1. Dehumanization Of The Palestinian And African Person.

The very existence of Israel and South Africa as states, as has been demonstrated, completely disregards the value or importance of the Arab or African personality in Palestine and Southern Africa, for, inherent in the creation of the two states was the racial arrogance that Arabs or Africans had no right to be where Jews or Boers wanted to be. Arabs and Africans had to give way because they were looked upon as being of less importance than either the Jews or Boers, not only because they were weaker, from the military point of view, or poorer in terms of the money or wealth they had, or technologically less advanced in terms of what they had invented or manufactured, but — and this is crucial — because they were essentially inferior. Hence the racial opprobrium heaped on the Palestinian Arabs and the black people of South Africa by the Jews and Boers who believe that they are what they are in their respective regions because of a special blessing bestowed on them by the Almighty God himself, which makes them superior to either the Palestinians or Africans. They, therefore, look upon themselves as people chosen by God, a situation they justify by invoking the sacred scriptures of the Holy Bible.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

The Jews believe that Palestine belongs to them because God promised it to the Patriarch Abraham and his children who, they say, they are. The Boers on the other hand, believe according to their religion (Calvinism), that they are like the children of Israel of yore, whom God led out of bondage in Egypt (British rule) into the Promised Land flowing with milk and honey, where servants (Africans) were also provided for them to draw water and hew wood.

However, those opposed to the Jews and Boers point out that God is the creator of all and everything, who is there for the good of all men and everything as, indeed, is laid down in the same Holy Bible that the Jews and Boers regard as their exclusive property. The well-informed point out that the Bible cannot be taken literally on every score. Nor can God be treated anthropomorphically, i.e., as though he were a human being who would "promise" anything in the same way as man does. Furthermore, the Bible appears to be filled with symbolism. God did, indeed, "promise" Canaan to Abraham and his offspring so that, through Abraham and his offspring, all the nations of the earth may receive God's blessing. It would, therefore, appear unwarranted to tie God to one or two nations, the Jews or Boers, who claim him as theirs alone. Besides, God blessed Abraham and his offspring so that, through them, his goodness may reach the rest of mankind. In other words, what God blesses has got to be seen as such by the entire human race. What God blesses must become holy and a source of happiness for all men. There does not seem to be much to suggest that either Israel or South Africa is holy and a source of happiness for all men, under prevailing circumstances. Nor can the Israelis or Boers claim to be holy or happy, condemned, as their policies are, by the entire human race and beleaguered, as their respective regimes are, by those seeking their destruction. God's people, many people would argue, cannot be associated with racial divisions, racial strife and war, for God unites and brings about racial harmony and peace. Typical signs of God's promises or blessings are words such as these: "I bring you glad tidings which shall be of great joy to all men." (Luke 2, 10).

On the basis of their religious beliefs, Israelis and Boers have relegated Palestinian Arabs and black South Africans to positions

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

of inferiority, as is demonstrated by their philosophies of racial discrimination, Zionism and apartheid. Racial discrimination, as has already been stated, reduces the importance of the human person. It dehumanizes man. It was for this reason, mainly, that mankind could not condone Nazism, and not particularly for the Nazis' persecution of the Jews, the impression the Jews have been trying to create. For example, there has been a furore between certain Jewish groups in the United States and the Catholic leadership in Poland over the erection of a convent by a small community of Catholic nuns in Poland near the site of the Auschwitz concentration camp. In 1989, a small group of American Jews travelled to Poland to protest against the existence of the convent at the site which they associated with the suffering of Jews alone during the Second World War, at the hands of Nazi Germany. The Polish Catholic leadership, quite rightly, pointed out to the Jewish protesters that Nazism persecuted many other peoples, who included millions of Poles, and not just Jews.

There can be no doubt that mankind would have sought the destruction of Hitlerism even if it did not kill the Jews. Nazism killed Jews in their millions precisely because the philosophy of racial discrimination or supremacy on which it was founded was responsible for the thinking among the Nazis that Jewish lives were a matter of little importance. They, the Nazis or the master-race (*herrenvolk*), were the only people who mattered, which is echoed loudly by both the Israelis, especially in the occupied territories of Palestine, and by the Boers everywhere in Southern Africa. Accordingly, and quite logically so, they both deny the dominated peoples, basic human rights, seeing these as something the dominated peoples are not entitled to because they are not quite as human as they themselves are. To make this point clearer, the following points might help:-

N.B. These are excerpts from statements made to representatives of Amnesty International by Palestinian victims of Israeli beatings and torture in the occupied territories as contained in their document: **Israel and the Occupied Territories: Excessive Force: Beatings To Maintain Law and Order** (AI Index: MDE/15/32/88). Each statement was supported by a sworn affidavit.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

Samir Muhammad Khairi Salim Khamous was an 18-year-old labourer from Hawara in the district of Nablus. On 21 January, 1988, at about 10.30 pm, Israeli soldiers rounded up twelve youths — including Samir Khamous — from their homes. They were handcuffed and taken by bus outside the village where he and others were ordered to get off.

‘Nine soldiers got off with us and took us into the fields about 70-100 metres away and gagged us with pieces of cloth so that we couldn’t shout out. They then ordered us to lie down on the ground, and without asking any questions, they split up into three groups, assigning three soldiers to each of us, and began beating us with their wooden clubs. The three who were beating me concentrated on my legs, especially my left leg. I tried to shout as loudly as I could when they were beating me but I couldn’t because of the gag over my mouth. I was writhing in pain and they carried on beating me like this for about 10 or 12 minutes until they saw that my condition had deteriorated. I was exhausted and couldn’t move my legs. While they beat me they yelled out in Hebrew. Afterwards they took off all our handcuffs and left us lying on the ground. I tried to get up but I couldn’t. I had a terrible pain in my left leg and couldn’t stand on it at all. The other two got up and left and I crawled to the main road’.

He was eventually taken to Rafidiyya Hospital in Nablus, where he received first aid and was x-rayed. His leg was found to be fractured in two places. Amnesty International received affidavits from his two companions also. One had a broken leg. The other had badly bruised legs and a deep wound in his leg, which required stitches.

On 30 January, 1988, another youth, Muhammad Said Al Jamal-lah, aged 18 years, was set upon by about 15 Israeli soldiers as he walked a street in Gaza City and severely beaten. A report by an eye-witness:-

‘(I) saw several Israeli soldiers dragging the young man along the ground on his back, kicking him over his entire body, stomping on his abdomen and genitals, punching him with their fists, and pounding him with wooden truncheons. The boy’s head, face and neck were entirely covered with blood, and his nose was obvi-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

ously broken. He had deep bleeding gashes on his forearms. The Israeli soldiers pulled upward and as the boy began to stand, one soldier kicked him twice in the genitals. As the boy doubled over in pain, another soldier kicked him under the chin and the boy fell backward. As he sat on the ground, three soldiers delivered several punches to his face and neck. Then one soldier grabbed his hair and pulled the boy to his feet. He was then pushed and pulled across the street where the soldiers handcuffed him to a door of a closed shop on the street.'

The eye-witness, at a later stage, tried to intervene with the commanding officer, Tommy Lugovsky, as well as a doctor who tried to treat the boy and two elderly Muslim priests who also tried to treat the boy's wounds, were all hit by the soldiers. Amnesty International received three other eye-witness accounts of this incident.

Rami Al Akluk, aged 14, from Deir al Balah camp in Gaza, was beaten by soldiers on 5 February, 1988, and died in hospital the next day. The Israeli authorities, as South African authorities often do regarding Africans, said that the autopsy revealed that he had died of a brain haemorrhage caused by an illness. In both Israel and South Africa, the authorities, when incidents of this nature occur, involving state agents ill-treating Palestinians or Africans, oftener than not, attribute resultant death to causes other than the ill-treatment, such as severe beating.

Afif Al Daraduk, aged 60 from Nablus, was beaten by soldiers on 9 February, 1988, and died in hospital on 11 February.

The following illustrates the kind of importance the Israelis attach to Jewish lives or the lives of their own people, as compared with Palestinian lives.

In March, 1988, the Israelis felt particularly hurt at the loss of only one of their soldiers, who was shot by the Palestinian resisters as the Intifada raged on. At the time their man died, Israeli soldiers had shot and killed more than a hundred Palestinian Intifada resisters. One Palestinian boy was killed for merely displaying a Palestinian flag. On 6 April, 1988, a Jewish girl, aged 15 years was killed by Palestinians. She was the first civilian Jewish casualty since the unrest began towards the end of 1987. Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, joined mourners at the funeral of the girl and

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

declared that the fight for law and order had to be intensified. The death of one Jewish girl, in other words, was viewed by Mr. Shamir as a serious breach of law and order. The deaths of more than a hundred Palestinians, many of them killed by Israeli soldiers in cold blood, deserved no mention.

After, reportedly, 40 000 Palestinians had been detained by the Israeli authorities, a fact that was acknowledged by Israeli Minister of Defence, Yitzhak Rabin, in October, 1989, (BBC news broadcast, 11 October, 1989), the Government of Israel during the same month, decreed that each of the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip would henceforth be obliged to carry a computerized identity card (pass in South Africa) in order to enter Israel. Note the resemblance between this and the South African passes carried by Africans as well as the Nazi methods of identifying Jews during the Second World War.

At the end of August, 1988, the Israeli authorities expelled four more Palestinians from the West Bank (BBC news, 24 August, 1988). A few days later, Israeli planes attacked Shi'ite Hizbollah positions in Southern Lebanon. Earlier in July, Israeli troops had kidnapped a local leader of the Hizbollah, Sheikh Obeid. Southern Lebanon has been turned by the Israelis into a buffer zone or *cor-don sanitaire* to cushion off attacks by Palestinian guerrillas based in Lebanon or Syria.

The United Nations Security Council on 31 August, 1988, passed a resolution deploring Israeli deportations of Palestinian civilians from the occupied territories. The United States of America for the first time abstained from voting, making it possible for the resolution to be adopted. Their representative later explained that the abstention by the United States was a deliberate move to make Israel realize that she could not continue to ignore the United Nations resolutions, as she had grown accustomed to. This was unprecedented. Until then, the United States had always used its veto to block any resolution condemning Israel. However, the United States representative made it clear that the move in no way affected the friendship between the two countries.

This was the fourth time in 19 months that the United Nations Security Council had denounced Israel on the issue of deportations. By that date, the Israelis had deported 58 Palestinians, mostly to

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World
Lebanon. The deportations were seen by many observers as reminiscent of the deportations of Jews by the Nazis from countries they had overrun during the Second World War.

The United Nations were at it again when, at the beginning of October, 1988, the General Assembly roundly condemned Israel for its treatment of Palestinians in the occupied territories. Only Israel itself and the United States opposed the resolution. Israel said afterwards that the condemnation had been unfair because the world body took no notice of the violence by what it called "Palestinian extremists." (BBC news, 7 October, 1988).

And a Palestinian man from the occupied territories was sentenced to life imprisonment, according to a BBC news broadcast on 30 October, 1989, for having caused the bus accident on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road in July, in which sixteen Jews died. He was sentenced to life imprisonment on each of the 16 counts of murder. There were 24 survivors. The man was, accordingly, sentenced, in addition, to twenty years' imprisonment on each of the 24 counts of attempted murder. This was described as unprecedented in Israeli legal history. The man had grabbed the bus steering wheel from the driver, forcing the vehicle to career off the road into a ravine.

The South African practices of racism that dehumanize the black African person follow a similar pattern, as the following illustrations will demonstrate. Writing on South Africa's notorious farm prisons, South African-born Mary Benson has this to say:-

"... recently the departments of Native Affairs and Justice together with the South Africa Police had devised a scheme whereby unemployed Africans or petty offenders were induced to accept labour on farms. As a rule they were sent to farms where the owner was so notoriously bad an employer that he could not get labour any other way. The atrocious abuses under this system had been disclosed by a Johannesburg Attorney, assisted by the Black Sash. There were still cases of farmers or their 'boss-boys' beating labourers until they died or were severely injured. Men had been virtually abducted to farms, locked up at night to prevent them 'escaping'; kept in overcrowded badly ventilated huts, there they had to sleep in filthy blankets or lousy sacks. Half drums were brought in

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

at night for sanitary pails. There was little water for drinking, less for washing. Food was mainly mealie-meal." (Mary Benson — *THE STRUGGLE FOR A BIRTHRIGHT*. Penguin Books, 1966. p. 210).

The following illustration shows the attitude of most South African white farmers towards African labourers forcibly taken to them in the manner above, usually for not being in possession of the pass or for being unemployed or for being regarded as nuisance by whites. These Africans are often treated no better than beasts of burden.

"In September, 1954, Johan Snyman of Harmonie Farm, Koster District, in the Transvaal, was brought before Mr. Justice Dowling on the Western Circuit. The charge was murder. The victim was an African convict-labourer, Elias Mpikwa. Farm prisons and farm-labour are used a great deal in South Africa: they serve the purpose of combining justice with economy. And, of course, they please the farming community, which is a most important matter . . . Before the trial began, three jurymen bearing English names were withdrawn from the jury. I will allow Mr. Snyman to speak for himself . . . ! 'Mpikwa . . . stood there just like a tree stump. I gave him a couple of blows with the hosepipe and he walked in a slow, brutal way and stood again, refusing to work. I hit him again and again. It occurred to me that this Kaffir felt nothing with his sack on . . . I told a native to remove it, so that I could hit him on the thighs and see if he could feel anything'. Mpikwa died . . . The jury considered their verdict, and found Snyman guilty of common assault it is said by majority of seven to two." (Trevor Heddleson - *NAUGHT FOR YOUR COMFORT*. Fontana Books, 1956, p. 147).

The following words are about the domineering and racially arrogant attitude most whites in South Africa have towards Africans. Here is Mary Benson again.

"But the patriotism of the Africans was irrepressible; they could be heard in country places singing 'Tipperary' in Xhosa, and as soon as they were called for to do menial tasks, they joined up in their tens of thousands . . . Turcos, Algerians, Moroccans, Jamaicans, were doing wonderful deeds for the

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

cause of the Allies; that the Canadian troops included Red Indians; but the non-whites of South Africa were required only as wagon drivers and ordelies, exposed to all the risks of war. If they were shot, they were not even mentioned in casualty lists. Native drivers were classed with transport mules, except that if a mule were killed the owner was compensated." (Mary Benson, op. cit. p.34).

Like the Israelis, white South Africans feel particularly hurt if one of them is beaten up, more so if killed, by an African. This is how they tend to react.

"They appeared out of the darkness one night on a stealthy mission of vengeance, and for two weeks they have terrorized the black township of Kagiso. Gangs of armed whites, their faces hidden, cruised the dirt roads in unmarked trucks in search of blacks to attack. At first the gangs seemed bent on avenging the killings of two local white policemen during a mine strike last month. A physician at the local hospital said that on one particularly brutal night he treated 30 people for wounds . . . One man they couldn't save was 22-year-old Stephen Matshogo . . . was walking home when several men jumped him and beat him with clubs and pipes . . . a neighbour tried to carry Matshogo home but the young man's body was so broken it was impossible to lift in one piece". (Newsweek — March 24, 1986, p. 22).

In South Africa, the white men who beat up and killed Matshogo, could not be referred to as 'extremists' or even 'hooligans', for in their minds, their feelings and assessment, Matshogo was the extremist and hooligan who deserved the kind of punishment meted out to him. In all probability, he was not in any way connected with the killings of the two white policemen earlier. But then, he was a 'native', and native life in South Africa is expendable, as is Arab life in Israel. Nor would Matshogo have fared any better at the hands of South African Police who are there, ostensibly, to maintain law and order, but are, in fact, a tool of repression in the hands of the ruling class in order to protect white interests and in furtherance of white supremacy. On the very day the newly passed out South African police officer reports for duty, he is

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World
already equipped psychologically for the tasks of maintaining white privilege and white supremacy.

“At the Police College in Pretoria, (white recruits) are taught from a textbook, *‘Bantu way of thinking’*. ‘They cannot talk logically’, ‘They do not think in an abstract way, but concretely according to what they can feel, see or hear.’ Their way of thinking is ‘full of contradictions.’ There is no alternative to apartheid: ‘this is our only safeguard’”. (Denis Herbstein”: **WHITE MAN, WE WANT TO TALK TO YOU: PELICAN**, 1978, pp246, 247.)

The picture of the African this kind of training presents to the young white police recruit is that of a being that is not quite as human as members of his own race are. The African is a being that does not think or feel the same way as the white man does. Indeed, the African’s way of thinking and , therefore, of grasping things is subhuman or inferior to the white man’s. He is a being the white policeman should not handle as though he were human and, should their interests clash, then the African deserves no mercy, for this is for real human beings, the whites. The African, in that event, should be ruthlessly dealt with. Destroying him altogether would be fair recompense. Chief Albert Luthuli, an African nobility, an extremely well-educated man, well brought up, highly cultured, an excellent Christian, for several years President of the African National Congress of South Africa and 1961 Nobel Peace Prize winner, speaks of his own bitterly humiliating experiences with South African Police. He narrates an incident when the interests of his own people clashed with the interests of the white supremacists, the Treason Trial of 1956. Luthuli was picked up the Gestapo style early one morning.

“I was still in bed when the police knock came, but my wife, according to her industrious custom, was already up. She admitted them and they came through to the bedroom and ordered me out of bed. ‘Yes’, one of them greeted me, “— the day has come!’ I do not know what he meant, but one cannot but be aware that the Nationalists encourage their followers to look forward to showdowns, days of reckoning with their opponents.... Warrants were produced — first the warrant of arrest and then the search warrant. I sat down on the edge of

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

my bed and read them through. The charge of High Treason was unexpected, even though for some months the Minister of Justice and the Chief of Police had separately accused Congress of seditious and traitorous activity. We had, of course, expected the Government to do something. So I was surprised rather than shocked... Two policemen remained with me and two were stationed outside to watch the approaches to the house . . . The police produced a list of things they had power to seize . . . My eldest daughter decided to enliven proceedings. 'I want to relieve myself,' she said to the police. 'Nobody is to leave this House,' the man in charge replied.

'Well, will you tell me then what I'm supposed to do?' So two policemen escorted her down the garden to the lavatory and stood on guard while she was inside A policeman crammed some of it (paper) tightly into a briefcase which I highly prized — it was a gift from the Johannesburg Youth League.

'Can't you take the papers and leave the briefcase?' I asked.

'Then what do we carry all these documents in?'

'I don't know, but I value that briefcase and I don't see how it can be evidence of treason.'

'Part of our instructions is to seize any containers,' was the reply. The briefcase was not handed in as evidence. I haven't seen it since."

(Albert Luthuli — LET MY PEOPLE GO. Fontana Books, 1962 p. 145).

A highly respected leader of his own people and an international figure was thus humiliated in front of his family. To the South African police, of course, he was just another "Native" or "Kaffir", a subhuman. The leadership and authority he exercised among his people and the respect that he commanded meant nothing to the white supremacists. He was an upstart who had to be shown his real position. At the time this happened, Chief Albert Luthuli had been removed from the chieftainship of his people, the Zulu, by the Government of South Africa because he had refused to yield to Government pressures that he should abandon the political leadership of all the black peoples of South Africa con-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

ferred on him by the black people themselves. The Government wanted him, instead, to become a tribal leader in their grand design of creating Bantu Homelands, a step towards the full implementation of separate development between the black and white peoples of South Africa, a policy better known as apartheid. Luthuli refused to become a party to this. He chose, instead, the hard road to freedom and independence with its attendant risks and hazards. It is clear why the Boers should want to harass and humiliate him. After all, as far as they were concerned, wasn't he a mere "Native" subhuman?

The white man had embarked on a path towards entrenching himself further in power and authority as well as to secure as much of South Africa as he could at the expense of the black man, but, he insisted this was for the good of both black and white. Perhaps, more so of the black for whom the white man was to create new homes where he would be free and independent — the Homelands.

"Hertzog's gambit was to impress on them that his Bills were for their own benefit, that if they did not accept them they were doomed. He told them: 'It is not that we hate you, but if we give you the right to vote, within a very short space of time the whole Parliament will be controlled by Natives. I must tell you point-blank I am not prepared for this.' "

(Mary Benson — Op. Cit. p.68).

But blacks were determined to wrest power from the hands of the fanatical white supremacists, even if they were to die for this. As in Palestine among the Intifada resisters to Zionism or Israeli apartheid, the penalties inflicted by the white supremacists on black nationalist freedom fighters were harsh and cruel.

"Police 'interrogation' methods came under special scrutiny following the death in March, by 'natural causes', of Joseph Mdluli, an old-guard member of the African National Congress. His four security police 'interrogators', two white and two Africans, were charged with culpable homicide. The men did not appear in the witness box, but their counsel outlined their story. Mdluli had attempted to escape while being interrogated and had been forcibly overcome by the four accused. Later that day, after interrogation had been resumed, Mdluli had stood up holding his head and complaining of dizziness,

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

staggered and fell, hitting the back of a chair with his neck or chest. He died an hour later. The judge later listed:-

- three areas of bruising on the neck;
- abrasions over both cheeks, left elbow, right upper thigh, both shins, ankles and the right foot;
- extensive deep bruising of the scalp and abdominal muscles;
- deep bruising and haemorrhage over the lower rib cage;
- three fractured ribs;
- extreme congestion of the brain and many small haemorrhages;
- bloodstaining of the fluid of the brain;
- fractured Adam's apple; and
- blood-congested, water-logged lungs.

The three main prosecution witnesses were all forensic experts . . . Two other pathologists expressed strong doubts that the fatal injuries had been caused by a fall. Judge James himself considered that the police version was open to 'very considerable doubt' and further investigation was required to establish how Mdluli met his death. This important matter, said the judge, should not be left in its 'highly unsatisfactory condition'. The Natal Attorney-General announced that no further action would be taken over Mdluli's death, as there was 'not even a *prima facie* case for doing so.' (Denis Herbstein, — Op. Cit. p.225).

This is a typical example of how justice is dispensed in South Africa where black people are concerned and, especially, should they be considered opponents of apartheid, as Mdluli certainly was. He was a threat to the white man's security; a challenge to white supremacy. He, therefore, had to be removed, for he had no right to demand the kind of existence that only the white man was entitled to, to be in South Africa on a permanent basis. South Africa belongs, first and foremost, to the white man to whom alone it belongs to determine where the "Native" should or should not live, as prescribed by Dr. Verwoerd's Group Areas Act which, initially, was directed at Asiatics (mainly Indians and Pakistanis) and coloureds, but which, in the course of time, hit the black man harder than either the coloureds or Asiatics. Moreover, South African

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

law offers the blacks hardly any protection at all. It was, therefore, largely futile for anyone to try and bring the police officers suspected of having killed Joseph Mdluli before justice. They were agents of the state that denied the black man human rights and thoroughly dehumanized him. The state could not be expected to fight against itself. There is an Arabic saying: "When your enemy is your judge, to whom do you complain?"

The policies of racial discrimination based on racial superiority or supremacy practised by both Israel and South Africa against, respectively, Palestinian Arabs and Africans subject these two communities to every conceivable indignity man can inflict on fellow man.

2. Land Expropriation

After the Jews had set up the state of Israel, they embarked on steps to drive the Arabs out of Palestine, with a view to settling all of it, thus fulfilling their dreams of bringing about "Greater Israel", embracing the provinces of 'Judea' and 'Samaria' or the West Bank. As a first step, the Jews outlawed the very name of Palestine. Then, the Israeli Government worked out a programme to encourage Jewish immigration into Israel and the establishment of settlements for the immigrants on occupied Arab land, in contravention of international law, the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 and the IV Geneva Convention of 1949 Relative To The Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, especially after the 1967 war. The Israelis argue that Jews, as the Bible bears testimony, have a right to settle anywhere in Israel which, to them, includes the West Bank and Gaza. Hence the hundreds of Jewish settlements that have been set up in the occupied territories.

International Law and supporting conventions or competent organs of the United Nations make it abundantly clear that lands occupied as a result of belligerency or war, are held under temporary supervisory control after which they must revert to the original inhabitants. The occupying power, therefore, has no right whatsoever to settle its own citizens permanently on occupied land such as the West Bank or Gaza, as this constitutes annexation. The Geneva Convention for the Protection of Civilians in Wartime (1949) to which Israel is a party is very explicit on this point.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

The Israelis also advance another argument, the so-called “missing reversioner”, which questions sovereign claims to the West Bank by any foreign government, which frees Israel of any constraints embodied in international law regarding belligerent occupation. By this, the Israelis argue that no one can prove the sovereignty of the occupied territories at the time they fell into their hands. That is, they belonged to no one; the argument they believe is supported by the Arabs’ rejection of the United Nations plan to partition Palestine, thereby leaving the British mandate over Palestine in force — and that was not against Jewish settlements anywhere. However, the British mandate was terminated by the United Nations who substituted their partition plan therefor, albeit the Arab nations refused to accept the legal validity of the plan and resorted to war to express their deep sense of rejection. Moreover, the international community, including Israel’s main backer, the United States of America, are agreed that Israel’s maximum legal claim to the occupied territories must conform to the international law on belligerent occupation, following the 1967 war. That is, Israel’s control of the territories is solely for military purposes and of a temporary nature. But, in complete defiance of the international community, Israel settles its citizens in the occupied territories and allows land purchases by Jews despite Arab protests. In addition, thousands of Arabs have been evicted from their lands for what the forces of occupation have often termed “military security” which, in fact, in most cases has been for the erection of more settlements. On 1 September, 1982, the Reagan Administration in the United States put forward a plan to establish a freeze on further settlements, which was promptly rejected by the Israelis, and this has severely complicated the situation as well as aggravated the tension in the area. The Israeli attitude is a serious obstacle to any peace initiatives, for the settlements constitute a deliberate violation of international law and human rights as they trample on the national rights of Palestinians to self-determination.

Regarding Israeli violations of human rights, it is important to draw a distinction between:

- (a) Arab inhabitants of Modern Jerusalem and other Palestinians who were uprooted and expelled in 1948 and, subsequently, refused re-entry; and

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

(b) The inhabitants of Old Jerusalem and other Palestinians who have, since 1967, been subjected to Israeli occupation.

Palestinians falling under (a) are refugees and are regarded as aliens by the Israelis who also treat them as such. They are denied their human, legal and fundamental rights, for, they cannot return to their homes; they cannot live, work or die in their ancestral homeland; they cannot keep their lands and homes; they cannot exercise their civil and political rights in their own country. In other words, they are deprived of their dignity and their rights as human beings.

“There exists no precedent in modern times of such a usurpation of a historic homeland and the permanent exile of its original inhabitants for the purpose of replacing them by alien immigrants. There exist many other refugees in the world today, but none have suffered the inhuman and unnatural fate of the Palestine refugees.” *The unique character of the Palestine tragedy has, indeed, been the subject of many an international conference on the Middle East. (*Henry Cattani: **JERUSALEM, ISRAELI CONCEPTS, POLICIES AND PRACTICES: PLO Unified Information: International Symposium, Washington DC, 1985, p. 13).**

Under (b) are Palestinian victims of Israeli occupation of Old Jerusalem and other territories since 1967. The United Nations have since 1968 focused their attention on the Israeli violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms in this sector. They set up a special committee to “Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting Human Rights of the Population in the Occupied Territories, including the city of Jerusalem”. The Israeli authorities have refused to co-operate with the committee and have stopped the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories from testifying before the committee. Nevertheless enough information has come through regarding the realities of Israeli occupation, and the United Nations General Assembly has time and again condemned Israel for its violations of human rights in the occupied territories. These violations consist in de facto annexation, the establishment of settlements to accommodate Jewish immigrants, deportations and expulsions of Palestinians and denial of their right to return, confiscation of private and public property, interference with the educa-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

tional system in Arab schools such as the deliberate distortion of facts relating to Palestinian history, interference with the landscape so as to change or obscure its historical significance, tampering with religious sites such as the setting on fire of the Al-Aqsa mosque in 1969, demolitions of Arab homes, collective punishment and mass arrests, administrative detention, ill-treatment and torturing of people under detention. All these things, almost to the minutest detail, are repeated by the Boers in South Africa against Africans. The aim of the Israeli authorities is to make life for the Arabs in the occupied territories unbearable so that they flee or emigrate, thus creating space for more Jewish immigrants and contributing towards Government programme of the Judaization of Palestine.

Israelis have often tried to cover up their evictions or expulsions of thousands of Arabs from their lands following what they euphemistically call, "war of independence", which was, in fact, a war of aggressive invasion. They stress that many Arabs lost their nerve at the sight of the advancing Jewish armies and fled. Others, they add, abandoned their homes in response to calls to do so made by other Arabs in the neighbourhood. But current Israeli Minister of Defence, Yitzhak, Rabin, is reported to have written a book, his memoirs, which appears to be at variance with these stories.

"In it, Rabin describes a strategy meeting with Ben-Gurion and his own commanding officer, Yigal Allon. The problem: what to do about the Arab populations of Ramla and Lydda (now called Lod), located along the strategic road from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. 'We walked outside, Ben-Gurion accompanying us,' says Rabin's account. 'Allon repeated his question: 'What is to be done with the population?' B.G. waved his hand in a gesture which said, 'Drive them out!' 'The population of Lod', Rabin recalls, 'did not leave willingly. There was no way of avoiding the use of force and warning shots'. 'The inhabitants of Ramla watched and learned the lesson.'"
(Newsweek magazine: November 5, 1979 p.27).

Sometimes, to strike terror into the hearts of the Arabs, so that they would flee their homes, the Jews resorted to wanton killing of as many Arabs as they liked, as they did on 9 April, 1948, when members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi, to which Menachem Begin also belonged, massacred 300 men, women and children at a small vil-

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

lage called Deir Yassin, near Jerusalem. Indeed, the massacre of Deir Yassin had the desired effect on the Arab residents of Modern Jerusalem, who in 1945 numbered about 24 000 Christians and about 21 000 Moslems, according to United Nations document A/1286, who fled or were killed when Jewish forces attacked the city in May, 1948.

When the Jews seized the city in 1967, orders were issued to the inhabitants of Old Jerusalem to leave and seek refuge into Jordan. As many as 30 000 Arabs are believed to have left in this manner; quite obviously fearing the worst might happen to them if they did not leave. The total number of Arab refugees who entered Jordan in this way was estimated at 410 248. The United Nations appealed to the Government of Israel to allow the refugees to return home. Israel allowed only a token 14 000 while, at the same time, she expelled 17 000. Of the 14 000 Arabs repatriated, very few were former residents of Old Jerusalem. The majority came from elsewhere. This was deliberately done to encourage or accelerate the pace of the Judaization of the city which in 1980 was declared the "eternal" capital of Israel. Notice the arrogance in the word "eternal".

Israel believes she can get away with whatever she does, as narrated here, mainly because of the support she receives from the United States of America, military, political and economic. The same is true of South Africa. Israel will continue to defy the world on the issue of her illegal occupation of Arab land, which is now de facto annexation, and on the issue of her trampling down on the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the Palestinians, so long as she continues to enjoy American support. And, as long as the United States abstain from using their leverage to influence Israel for peaceful change in the occupied territories, the Americans cannot escape being regarded by the world at large as a party to all that Israel does in the occupied territories of Palestine and in the Middle East.

In South Africa, land grabbing by Dutch settlers at the expense of the local African population, which began with the arrival of the first Dutchmen at the Cape in 1652, continued unabated through the years and led to serious fighting between the African

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

owners of the land, who resisted the grabbing, and the Dutch settlers or ancestors of modern South African whites who are also known as Boers or Afrikaners. Thousands of Africans, who were armed with only spears, bows and arrows, were killed by the better armed white men who wielded the gun. Like the Jews in Palestine many years later, the Boers intended to terrorize the Africans into leaving their lands, which they did in many parts of the country, for the Boers to take over as their own. Thus began the notion "white South Africa". To protect white South Africa, the Boers, who had now been joined by the British, pushed the Africans into what came to be known later as "Native Reserves", the nucleus of the current "Homelands" or "Bantustans" that South Africa created after the Nationalists' accession to power in 1948, to usher in apartheid or separate racial development. Henceforth, the presence of Africans in white South Africa would only be temporary, for economic reasons, i.e., for their labour which was badly needed in the development of white South Africa, in much the same way as Arab labour is needed in the development of Israel. But the African in white South Africa, as the Arab in Israel, was not allowed to partake of the fruits of his labour.

The South African Government, with British connivance, by an act of Parliament that came to be known as the Native Land Act of 1913, enacted under the direction of General J.B.M. Hertzog, later to become South Africa's third Boer Prime Minister, legalized land grabbing by whites, that had been going on for hundreds of years. By this law, Government set aside a paltry 7.3 percent of the land area for Africans who accounted for nearly 70 percent of the total population, while 92.7 percent, including all of the major cities and towns, was reserved for whites who constituted barely 20 percent of the population. Land allocated to Africans was later in 1936 increased to 13 percent, and this has not changed to the present moment. The 87 percent of the land reserved for/allocated to white South Africa includes nearly all the arable and productive land that has made South African farming world-famous. On the other hand, Africans or more than 70 percent of the total population and their animals have to be contented with the remaining 13 percent of largely poor or unproductive land, that can hardly sustain life.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

Like the Jews in Palestine, the Boers got most of the good land in South Africa by evicting or expelling Africans from lands that had been theirs for generations. Sometimes they even used tricks to cheat Africans out of land. These evictions of Africans from their lands did not end with the Hertzog Bills of 1936 that increased to 13 percent the land reserved for Africans. They continued through the years to the present moment. The Government of South Africa or indeed individual Boers, have the power, derived from white supremacy, to declare or to influence the declaration of any land occupied by Africans or non-whites "white", should need to do so arise. The white man has the power to tamper even with the 13 percent of land reserved for Africans if he so wishes or should it suit him.

Africans deprived of their land often turn into vagrants or beg the white man to allow them to remain on the land, that not so long ago used to be theirs, in exchange for their free labour. Many, out of desperation, become squatters on the lands of white South Africa, leading lives of misery and uncertainty. Still, many, indeed many more, drift to the big cities of Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban, Cape Town, etc, to look for work. There, their presence is tolerated by the white man for as long as they are able to work. There must be no suggestion of permanence about the presence of the black man in white South Africa. For the white man has decreed that:

"You have to make sure that the native in the urban areas is, and knows that he is there on sufferance. That he has no permanence of any kind. That he is a migrant whose sole purpose is to provide labour in factory and office and home for the white-man-boss. " "There is no room," ' says the Minister of Native Affairs, ' "for him in European society above the level of certain forms of labour." ' The whole conception, therefore, of native housing in the cities must be governed by this most vital consideration. There must be no permanence about it . . . It must be impossible for any African, whatever his social position, whatever his wealth, to own his home in the town so that he can regard it as permanently his possession and that of his children." (Trevor Huddleston — NAUGHT FOR YOUR COMFORT Fontana Books, 1956 p.41)

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

Indeed, whole communities have been uprooted to drive home to the understanding of everybody, particularly blacks, that the white man in South Africa will not share what he has with the black man and that the presence of the black man in white South Africa must be accompanied by this one element, impermanence. Therefore, should the black man's presence in white South Africa in any way suggest permanence of any kind or degree, then the black man must move. He must go, for any suggestion of permanence about his presence in South Africa threatens the white man. He must go so that the white man can feel safe and secure. He must go, for permanence of any degree about his presence in South Africa suggests equality with the white man. That cannot be allowed, for the black man is another creature, not quite as human as the white man. He must go, for he does not belong to South Africa. His home is in the Reserves or Bantustans. Here, again, is Trevor Huddleston on the uprooting of a whole black Community, Sophiatown in 1955, by white South Africa.

"But to-day is not normal: not at all. In fact, I am saying Mass an hour early because it is "the Day"; because it is the beginning of the end of Sophiatown: because from now nothing will ever be the same again in this little corner of South Africa: because today the great removal is beginning, and all the people I know and the houses they live in will soon be scattered, and Sophiatown itself will crumble into dust . . . By the gate there is already a little group of men, waiting. They are African correspondents of many of the British and overseas newspapers . . . A light rain is falling. Suddenly, from the corner out of sight . . . there comes a sound I have never heard in Sophiatown before. It is the noise of men marching. The staccato "Hep, Hi, Hep, Hi . . ." getting louder . . . A detachment of African police under European command marches raggedly but purposefully past us, down hill. People appear from their houses in the darkness and stand, chattering but subdued, to watch this new and unfamiliar sight. . . The first lorries began to move off for Meadowlands eight miles away to the west. The rain poured down. The removal was definitely underway. Two thousand police, armed; . . . a total ban on all gatherings, including (as was thought at the time)

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

attending at a church service. All this, to effect a slum-clearance scheme which would be of lasting benefit . . . a crying necessity if white civilization was to be preserved.” (Trevor Huddleston: Op. Cit. p.133)

Sophiatown had to go because it was too close to white Johannesburg, although it was the latter that had expanded towards it and, therefore, had encroached on it. Sophiatown had to go all the same. Moreover, its freehold rights for Africans suggested African permanence in white South Africa. It surely had to go.

Dr. Israel Shahak, a Jew opposed to Israel’s policies and practices regarding its treatment of Arabs both in Israel itself and in the occupied territories, writing on the ideological common ground between Israel and South Africa, has this to say:

“This land is intended for the benefit of all . . . citizens regardless of race, religion or other human qualities. For example, if such land is being leased or offered for sale or new housing is built on it, all . . . citizens are legally entitled to benefit from it. To try to exclude the . . . Jews from this basic right would constitute a clear act of anti-semitism and I am sure that almost all the . . . public would oppose such a proposal. But we should remember that this basic right is observed also by many other regimes, even if they are dictatorial, in all areas of the globe, east and west. In the Israeli occupied territories the situation is exactly reversed. The land which has been confiscated, by whatever legal subterfuge, is openly and officially devoted to the use of Jews only, for the sole reason that they are Jews. The confiscated land is not officially designated for the use of Israeli citizens, for about 15 per cent of Israeli citizens are Palestinians. It is devoted to the use of Jews, whether they are citizens of Israel, or any other state.” (Israel Shahak — ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA: The ideological common background: PLO Unified Information, p.36)

As in South Africa, all land deemed useful by the state, including land that was reclaimed from Sophiatown, is for the exclusive use of white people regardless of whether they are citizens of South Africa or not.

If one were to enumerate the similarities between Zionist Israel and apartheid South Africa and to put down on paper instances

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

of persecution meted out by the two states to their victims, respectively the Palestinian Arabs and the black people of South Africa, one would come up with very long lists of both. Suffice it to state that if there were no such a country as the United States of America which supports both Israel and South Africa and, itself with its own discriminatory practices against black people and other minority racial groups, Zionism in Israel and apartheid in South Africa would have found it very difficult indeed to take root. However, there are signs that American support for either Israel or South Africa may not continue unchanged for very long. There is a growing realization in the United States of America that something ought to be done on the universal outcry against Israeli and South African violations of human rights in the occupied territories and everywhere in South Africa. The Americans cannot reconcile the fact that they are the world's leading nation in terms of affluence, military might and technological achievement and the world's leading democracy with their support for racial tyranny and injustice in Israel and South Africa. The United States ought to take a stand on the racial persecution of Arabs by Israel and of Africans by the Boers in South Africa, despite the strong Jewish lobby in America and South Africa. Nor should they be inhibited by any other consideration. America cannot afford to play second fiddle to the Soviet Union whose programme of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost* seems to be performing miracles in the Soviet Union itself, in the Baltic States and in East Europe where, not only has the world heard of Communism relaxing its grip (regarded in the West as stifling) on man, but there has been a swing towards a return to democratic principles in several parts of Eastern Europe as well. For the first time since the end of World War II, the Government of Poland is in the hands of non-communists and Hungary was proclaimed a democratic socialist republic in October, 1989. Surely, the United States cannot lag behind the Soviet Union, regarded by many Americans as an undemocratic society. Democracy has come or seems to be coming to East Europe thanks to the Soviet Union. What have the Americans got to show for all their bragging about being the world's leading democracy? Clearly not much, if present day Israel and South Africa continue to be counted among their closest friends. The United States cannot

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

continue to be friendly or to be associated with those who trample down the fundamental freedoms of man or who blatantly violate human rights by denying freedom and human dignity to millions of human beings whose only crime is that they are not of the same race as those in power or, militarily, are not as strong as those who have taken it upon themselves to control their lives as Israelis and South Africans do the lives of Palestinian Arabs and Black South Africans respectively. Year in and year out, the United Nations in their various organs or agencies, condemn Israeli and South African persecution of dominated peoples, but both remain defiant, deriving their strength so to remain, from the unwavering support they receive from the United States of America. However, there are signs that this has begun to change or may soon begin to change.

In 1988, the United States, in a major policy statement, announced that they would establish contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in order to open dialogue with it, following the PLO's announcement that they had recognized Israel's right to exist and renounced violence as means to bring about change. Amid protests and denouncements from Israel, the United States ambassador to Tunisia and representatives of the PLO duly met in Tunis to open dialogue which, happily, they have kept alive. At the same time, the United States committed themselves to the Namibian independence plan and played a vital role in the negotiations that eventually led to the setting up of a special United Nations committee charged with the responsibility to supervise the Namibian independence process that is peacefully underway. The first ever democratically conducted elections in Namibia are due to be held in November, 1989, leading to independence for the territory in 1990. ★¹

Following the example of the United States, several West European nations which are also allies of the United States, established contacts with the PLO and appealed to Israel to listen to the voice of reason by taking steps towards accommodating the PLO and thus work for peace in the Middle East, instead of remaining ob-

★¹Namibia became an independent and sovereign state on 21 March, 1990.

Israel-South Africa Versus The Afro-Arab World

durate and unreasonable. Simultaneously, they backed the Namibian independence plan which was seen as a step towards tackling apartheid in South Africa itself. Prior to this, some of these nations had backed calls by the United Nations and the Organization for African Unity to apply economic sanctions on South Africa in order to force it to abandon apartheid and work for the establishment of a democratic society in South Africa.

Indeed, since these initiatives began, some changes have taken place in South Africa, both in Government leadership, in the political institutions and, people would like to believe, in the attitude of the Government of South Africa towards reform, which was, perhaps, demonstrated, in the Government's release of several African nationalist leaders from detention. Eight African nationalists were released in October, 1989, among them Walter Sisulu, former Secretary General of the African National Congress and the most important official of the organization after Nelson Mandela★¹ who, himself, is still in detention. The Government's apparent liberal approach to current events has contributed to a somewhat relaxed atmosphere in the politics of South Africa.

Many believe that with a little more pressure from the quarters that matter, both Israel and South Africa will initiate peaceful change, or will fall in line with those who have already started doing things in order to bring about a peaceful settlement in both Israel and South Africa. But, of course, for the forces of national liberation, there can be no relaxation. Nor should current peace initiatives, both real and apparent, give rise to complacency.

★¹Nelson Mandela was released from detention on 12 February, 1990.

Three

WHY ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA MUST FAIL

Recent history has shown that any state whose ideology, policies or *raison d'être* embodies aggressive or oppressive racism in the same way as Adolf Hitler's Germany or Benito Mussolini's Italy did, is doomed to disastrous failure. The reason is simply that aggressive or oppressive racism reduces the value of human life in the victims of this type of racism and, of necessity, denies man basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, reducing him to the level of things. Any doctrine, philosophy or belief that denigrates man's importance thus, must be wrong and evil, and, therefore, cannot be supported.

The clearest indication of failure is in the behaviour of the nations that adopt aggressive or oppressive racism as state policy. Almost without exception, they employ force or violence in the implementation or execution of this policy to realize their national goals or aims, as Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy did. Often victim nations of this policy have ganged up or have formed alliances should their resources, individually, prove inadequate, to fight this type of racism. Long and very costly wars in terms of both human lives and material resources have, almost invariably, been the result.

The situation is much worse when racism of this type is directed against individuals or sections of a nation's population, for it breeds internal strife, which leads to instability or civil war, should the situation be allowed to continue uncorrected. Civil war could

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

degenerate into war on a larger scale or could even become international, should forces from outside be drawn in.

We have seen that both Israel and South Africa have adopted or are founded on aggressive or oppressive racism as state policy. Both their neighbours and large sections of their populations, the Palestinians in the case of the former, and Africans in the case of the latter, who are victims of the racist policies pursued by either, resent and resist these policies, leading to tension and conflict in the Middle East and in South Africa as well as drawing in outside forces or interests, which might result in conflagrations of much greater dimensions to the detriment of international security and world peace. Hence the concern of the United Nations and the entire world over developments in Israel and South Africa.

The world, unfortunately, does not speak with one voice regarding these two trouble-spots. While almost unanimously condemning the Israeli prolonged and illegal occupation of Arab lands and its racist persecution of the Arabs in Israel and the occupied territories as well as apartheid and its concomitant racial practices against the black peoples of South Africa, the World is divided into two camps. A few countries, led by the United States of America supported by their West European allies and Japan, have decided to side with Israel and South Africa principally for political and economic reasons, as we have seen, and not because the two pursue right or defensible policies. This is tragic. The rest of the world, comprising the overwhelming majority of the world's nations, supported, not led, by the Soviet Union and the entire Communist Bloc, side with the victims of the Israeli and South African racism, namely the Palestinians and Africans. Thus the United States who claim to be the world's leading democracy, in an endeavour to oppose Communism, have found themselves in an awkward position of siding with or defending racist and tyrannical regimes, Israel and South Africa. Their position has become all the more embarrassing in view of the many — and quite admirable — political reforms that Mikhail Gorbachev's *perestroika* and *glasnost* have made possible in the communist world, particularly in Eastern Europe, reforms that have turned Communism into a tolerant and accommodating doctrine, as opposed to the enslaving tyranny that the United States of America have always said it was. Vis-a-vis the sit-

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

uation in Israel and South Africa, it is the Soviet Bloc that certainly appears to be for peace and man's happiness, rather than the Americans and their allies. What do the so-called democracies and "free world" stand for, if not for peace and man's happiness? This is the question the Americans and their allies in the West must seriously address themselves to. There are signs, as already stated, that the Americans intend to or have initiated a process that, perhaps, in the not-too-distant future, will associate them with that which is right, morally defensible and compatible with those democratic principles which, they say, their society is founded on. Hence the dialogue between the representatives of the United States Government and those of the Palestine Liberation Organization that the whole world would like to see bear fruit. The American role in the negotiations that brought about the Namibian Peace Plan is an invaluable contribution towards bringing about a peaceful settlement of the problems of the entire Southern African sub-region.

But, why do the Israelis, especially, and the Afrikaners want to hold out, when they should know from their own past that they cannot win? Should we all, perhaps, be led into believing, as has often been suggested in some quarters, that there is something intrinsically wrong or sinister with the Jews that, perhaps, may explain why, for centuries, they have been resented and discriminated against in many parts of the world, including the New World?

' "I hope none of you are Jews. If you are, you had better get out now, because I am going to flunk you." ' As that announcement by a prominent law professor echoed through the lecture hall at the University of Buenos Aires, it produced barely a wince. Anti-Semitic insults are all too familiar to Argentina's 300 000 Jews. They are heard on the streets, in the shops, even over the airwaves of government-run television. Late last year the host of a popular talk show baited his guest, a Jewish engineer: ' "If the Jews have been persecuted for 4 000 years, there must be some reason for it, don't you think?" ' Such remarks may be nothing new — not in Argentina or in any number of other countries . . . Traces of anti-Semitism can be found throughout Argentine society. By custom Jews are barred from leadership in major political groups. By unspoken

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

fiat Jews cannot attain senior rank in the armed forces and are effectively blocked from positions of state power . . . ” ’
(Newsweek, August 10, 1981. p.37).

Of course, one cannot admit that there is anything intrinsically wrong or sinister with Jews, for this would be both racist and anti-semitic. One is aware of the very many excellent Jewish men and women one has come across. But Jews must stop thinking that they are a special people and desist from treating any adverse comments or remarks about them as reflections of anti-semitism in whoever makes these comments or remarks. The Arabs too are semitic. Former Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Menachem Begin, once, acknowledging this fact, referred to disputes between Arabs and Jews as “the children of Abraham quarrelling”. But the Arabs do not make any issue of the fact that they are semitic. Why should the Jews? Often concealed behind the Jewish cries of anti-semitism is the suggestion that they are a special people, selected by God himself for a privileged position in the society of men. They conclude that they are resented and abused the world over by the less privileged or gentiles because of their special position in society, which is also sanctioned by the Holy Bible.

Likewise, the Boers in South Africa regard themselves as God’s own chosen people, specially blessed to inherit the riches of South Africa or the land flowing with milk and honey, to which God in his Divine Providence led them. They pour scorn on the Africans as the cursed descendants of Ham, whose God-arranged and, therefore, immutable lot is to labour and toil for the white man for ever, as drawers of water and hewers of wood. The Boers’ is the civilized Christian society charged with the responsibility to fulfil God’s will among the primitive heathen tribes of South Africa, whom they should guide to a better life of their own. The Boers call this guidance ‘voogskap’. But there is no way the African can possibly become their equal in that the inequality between him and themselves has been ordained by God himself. This kind of thinking is reflected in a letter written by South Africa’s Prime Minister, Dr. D.F. Malan in reply to one written to him by two African nationalist leaders of the African National Congress, Dr. Moroka and Walter Sisulu on 21 January, 1952. In their letter, the two African nationalists had pointed out how much the African people suffered

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

under the recently introduced discriminatory legislation, which they asked the Government to repeal or they would organize the Africans to hold demonstrations on van Riebeck Day, as a prelude to implementing their plan to defy unjust laws.

“A week later the Prime Minister’s Secretary wrote to Sisulu reproaching him for writing to the Prime Minister rather than the Minister of Native Affairs, and questioning his claim to speak authoritatively on behalf of the body known to the Government as the A.N.C. ‘It was self-contradictory,’ he said, to claim that Bantu should be regarded as no different from Europeans, ‘especially when it is borne in mind that these differences are permanent and not man made.’ The Government had no intention of repealing the laws — in any event they were not ‘oppressive and degrading’, they were ‘protective’. If Congress pursued the course indicated, the Government would ‘make full use of the machinery at its disposal to quell any disturbances and thereafter deal adequately with those responsible for initiating subversive activity’.” (Mary Benson. *op.cit.* p.141).

Notice the phrase, ‘these differences are permanent and not man made.’ The differences in question are those of inequality between whites and blacks in South Africa, which the Boers believe, according to their religion (Calvinism), are ordained by God and, therefore, cannot be challenged by anyone, least of all the Africans. Because these differences are ordained by God, therefore, they are permanent. Thus religion is used in both Israel and South Africa to justify the presence of Jews in Palestine and the Boers in South Africa as something divinely willed. That is to say, something man can do nothing about.

However, man the world over believes — indeed has always believed that there is something dignified and sacred about human life, no matter the colour of the skin in which it is wrapped. The reason for this is that human life, so is the belief, is derived from God himself, acknowledged by everybody as the creator of all men, regardless of race or colour, and of everything. It is universally held that because man’s life is derived from God, it is sacred and, therefore, it is wrong for anyone to either abuse or destroy it. Hence the inadmissibility of man’s killing or murder in every human so-

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

ciety. There is that in man which distinguishes him from the rest of creation here on earth, which, indeed, places him above all creation and makes him, as it were, master of all creation on earth. In fact, the world exists primarily for him. These qualities are universally acknowledged by all men as applicable to man. This means that men all over the world would disapprove of that which lowers man from the position universally given to him by all men. Medieval philosophers taught, "vox populi, vox Dei" (people's voice is God's voice), which meant that what was universally accepted and upheld, as a moral value, by men on the basis of their reason alone unaided by that which was taught them, often reflected God's own ideas about the same. In other words, man's position in creation has the support of God or has been ordained by God. Now, that which has been ordained by God is sacred. It follows, therefore, that man's position on earth is sacred. No one, therefore, has any right to abuse or mistreat man on such unimportant grounds as race, colour, creed, politics or economics. On this basis, what goes on in Israel and South Africa vis-a-vis relations between Jews and Arabs as well as relations between Boers and Africans, is inadmissible or wrong because it tampers with Man's sacred position on earth, a position given to him by God himself as, indeed, is acknowledged by all men. Hence the universal condemnation of Israeli or South African policies. There is no question of anyone being anti-semitic or anti-Christian here.

The behaviour of the two states, Israel and South Africa, is a clear manifestation of the fact that they are wrong. Their behaviour reveals a deep sense of guilt which engenders insecurity. This is the reason why they both maintain very large armies that they tend to equip out of proportion to their security requirements. The weapons the Israeli and South African armies wield are not matched by anything their principal adversaries, Palestinian Arabs or Africans have. Against whom are these deadly weapons of war intended, one might ask? It cannot be against the Palestinians or Africans, for they do not possess anything to challenge what the Israelis or South Africans have. A sensible man equips himself for a fight or war according to what the situation warrants. If the Israeli or South African quest for sophisticated weapons is motivated by fear of the possibility of regional alliances being formed against

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

them, this is only because they are aware that their positions are untenable, based as they are on wrong premises. This is made clear to them by their consciences.

Every normal person is endowed with a conscience or a law that is, as it were, stamped on his mind to guide his behaviour. The dictates of this law are absolute and not relative. That is, they do not permit any exceptions; nor are they dependent on any conditions at all. The dictates of man's conscience may be summed up into, "Good must be done, and Evil must be avoided" — *Bonum faciendum, et Malum vitandum*, as the Scholastic Philosophers would put it. It is impossible for a man to defend that which his conscience disapproves of, for any defensive mechanism that he may devise serves only to set him against himself. This perhaps explains why the Israelis and South Africans fight Communism or Terrorism, both abstract concepts. Of course, there is neither Communism nor Terrorism in either Palestine or South Africa. What there is is Palestinian or African nationalists seeking to restore themselves to their rightful positions in the lands of their birth, and these are no abstract ideas.

The Palestinian and South African black nationalists want their lands back, lands the ownership of which has been usurped by the Jews and Boers. Indeed, the presence of the Jews in Palestine and of Boers in South Africa has been condemned the world over, as blatant usurpation and an unpardonable injustice.

The Jews maintain that Palestine belongs to them by virtue of the fact that people they claim to be their ancestors once lived there, several thousands of years ago. If this argument were carried to its logical conclusion, the whole world would be plunged into a fearful commotion. Everything regarding human habitation would be in a state of flux, for many countries, if not all, would have to change hands. Thus, for example, in England, the English would have to give way to the Celts, i.e., the Irish, Scots and Welshmen, whose ancestors lived there before the Anglo-Saxons arrived. Likewise, virtually everybody in the Americas would have to leave, for both Americas belonged to people known as "Indians" before Columbus's discovery. Australia and New Zealand would have to be surrendered to the Maoris and Aborigines, respectively, while the Boers in South Africa would promptly have to leave. The Jews

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

themselves cannot, really, claim Palestine as their land because it belonged to somebody else before Abraham settled there. Moreover, God did not order Abraham to expell those who were there before his arrival (Abraham's arrival). On the contrary, Abraham lived very happily in the midst of the people he found there. He treated everybody with kindness, which was reciprocated by his neighbours. Abraham did not have to wage war, as the Jews did in 1948, because God was with him. By God's arrangement, he and his offspring were going to live in Canaan or Palestine among other people without owning the land as theirs exclusively, so that through Abraham other people would receive God's blessing: "And through you I will bless all the nations." (Genesis 12,3.). There does not appear any suggestion that God intended Canaan or Palestine to be exclusively for Abraham and his offspring. In any case, it has been established that many of the Israeli Jews are converts to Judaism, and, therefore, they are not Abraham's descendants in the biblical sense.

The Boers's contention that South Africa belongs to them by right is even more tenuous. Unlike the Jews, they cannot claim that South Africa is the land of their forefathers, for their forefathers came from Europe. They cannot base their claim to South Africa on any solemn promise explicitly made by God to them. Theirs, as is known, is a typical example of invasion and conquest that cannot be explained any other way.

As befits usurpers everywhere in the world, both the Jews in Palestine and Boers in South Africa settled down to change the face of their booty. The Jews outlawed the name "Palestine" and substituted therefore "Israel", after expelling a large section of its population. The Boers named every important land mark or event after men they regarded as heroes or places, men or events in the Bible. Thus Stellenbosch, after the van der Stel brothers; Pretoria, after the Boer leader, A. Pretorius; Pietermaritzburg, after two Boer leaders, Pieter and Maritz; Krugersdorp, after the President of the Transvaal Republic, Paul Kruger, etc., etc. The Israelis designed education for the Arabs in the occupied territories in a way that obliterated any traces of Arabism both in Palestine itself and in the city of Jerusalem, as part of their Judaization of

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

Palestine programme. Part of the Boerization of South Africa programme by the Government of South Africa — and a very significant one — was, undoubtedly the imposition of the Afrikaans language in African schools as a medium of instruction, which in 1976, sparked off very serious riots (the Soweto Uprising) by African school children in protest against the use of a language that had no international recognition and was, therefore, looked upon by them as another step by the Government towards confining African education to South Africa, with the aim of cutting off the black people from the outside world, especially from independent Africa. Several hundreds of the children, who were regarded as “terrorists” by the Government, paid with their lives.

“Terrorism” had come to be defined as encouraging any feeling of hostility between blacks and whites, or any description of white rule as oppressive.

“By that definition, the Soweto school children who protested in June 1976 were ‘terrorists’. Lacking national leadership and organisation, the school children, throwing stones, nevertheless launched a national confrontation with the Government. The authorities responded with brutal measures to identify ringleaders and haul them away. Detention laws had been progressively extended to allow police to hold suspects without charging them or bringing them before a court for twelve days (1962), ninety days (1963), 180 days (1965), for unlimited period if authorized by a judge (1966) and without such authorization (1976).”(Robert B. Ashmore-
ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA: A Natural Alliance: PLO unified information.p.63).~

The world was outraged. But South Africa continued to enjoy the support of its allies in the West, the United States of America and Great Britain, as particularly outstanding. Another feature of the Boerization programme is the creation by the Government of South Africa of Bantustans as separate “independent, sovereign states” for the black people who would then be obliged to abandon any claims they may have had to the citizenship of South Africa which, in the event, would become exclusively the whiteman’s home.

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

The Jews in Palestine had their Kibbutz Movement to which, of course, only the Jews belonged. Here is Dr. Israel Shahak:-

“But the Israeli organisation which has achieved both the greatest fame and popularity and also practises the greatest degree of racist exclusion, is no doubt the kibbutz the majority of Israelis have been aware of the racist character of the kibbutz as displayed not only against Palestinians, but against all human beings who are not Jews, for quite a long time..... this came out first because the largest kibbutz movement called the United Kibbutz Movement, is even more anti-Christian than it is anti-Arab. Since non-Jews cannot become kibbutz members because of its official exclusive character, the kibbutzim now employ many temporary workers under the misleading name of “volunteers”. Naturally, romantic love blooms between young men and women under these conditions, inspite of all official discouragement. The Christian partners had to be forced to convert to Judaism, since without such conversion they would not become members of a kibbutz.” (Israel Shahak — ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA: The Ideological Common Ground: PLO Unified Information. p.35).

All these manoeuvres are designed to mask Israel's and South Africa's deep sense of guilt which has given rise to a great feeling of insecurity in both. For mutual support and assistance, the two have banded together, out of fear that if one of them went, then the other would feel isolated, abandoned and in grave danger.

“You are few. We are few. You are surrounded by millions of enemies and so are we. The Arabs want to throw you into the sea. The blacks want to drive us out of Africa. In the past you have won and you shall win in the future because you have no other alternative. We shall also win because we have no other choice.” (Yossi Melam and Dan Raviv — ISRAEL - SOUTH AFRICAN RELATIONS: The power of Realpolitik: PLO unified Information p.84).

This was said by the head of South Africa's State Security, General Van den Bergh, when he spoke to journalist, Yehoshua Ben Porat, in September, 1975.

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

The human mind or conscience rebels when man ignores its dictates which command man to do that which is good or right and to avoid doing that which is bad, evil or wrong. Man becomes restless and unpredictable when he ignores the dictates of his conscience as is evident in the behaviour of both Israel and South Africa. They have both refused to listen to their consciences or to heed the voice of reason from the rest of mankind. Therefore, they cannot be at peace. They are restless and unpredictable. They feel exposed to danger all the time, like a man who has committed a serious crime, for whom no bush is thick enough to provide cover. They feel insecure and have to resort to arming themselves in case they are surprised. A criminal in flight sees danger in every person he meets and tends to either run away from that person or do him harm; or even kill him. Likewise, the Israeli and South African regimes, guilt-conscious, having trampled on the rights of man or having committed murder, see danger in all their neighbours whom they would like to run away from or silence. Hence the destabilization manouevres and hostile incursions by these states into neighbouring states. Basically, it is not their neighbours, Palestinians or Africans they are afraid of, but that within themselves which keeps on reminding them of their guilt. Some people believe that this is God's voice disapproving of the wrong done. Others call it conscience. Whatever people call it, it boils down to one thing, namely that law written in the mind of every normal person, which commands him to do good and avoid evil.

So long as Israel and South Africa remain committed to their current policies which deprive their fellow men of their freedom and human dignity, they will never themselves feel free, dignified or secure. They will keep on arming themselves against enemies who will always be there; and the deadliness of their weapons must always be stepped up, as an American television programme revealed recently, according to a BBC news broadcast at the end of October, 1989. South Africa, with the technological knowhow provided by Israel, was engaged in the production of a long-range nuclear missile. In exchange for the Israeli technological knowhow - obtained from the United States of America - South Africa was to provide Israel with enriched uranium for more nuclear exploits. The revelation upset the Government of the United States because

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

Israel was not allowed by them to pass on such knowledge to South Africa. Both Israel and South Africa promptly denied this. But Egypt, which did not take these denials seriously, challenged Israel to show its seriousness and sincerity by signing the international Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty; not signed by South Africa either. Nor did the denials impress many people, as Israel and South Africa, bosom-friends, have over the years shown no regard for world opinion on issues of this nature and already have a joint nuclear testing programme. In 1979, the two exploded a joint military nuclear device over the Southern Atlantic. The United States reaction does not impress many people either, except, perhaps, their friends in the West and Japan. The Americans know or should know that the nuclear technology they make available to Israel, finds its way to South Africa. It is the United States of America, therefore, which is ultimately responsible for this very dangerous situation. Israeli or South African hands are not tied by the restraints embodied in the international Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in this regard. They are free, therefore, to commit their energies to any nuclear testing programme they fancy, and the United States would be a party to anything Israel and South Africa may come up with. The United States, however, appears, as has been discussed, to have embarked on a course of action to make amends for the unqualified support it has been giving to both Israel and South Africa by engaging itself in dialogue with the PLO and by giving a helping hand to the Southern African Peace Process now underway. But, some of the Americans' friends or allies appeared to be incorrigible, particularly Japan.

"The Japanese appear to have no morals at all when it comes to business or money," one irate African diplomat told me one day at the United Nations Headquarters in New York in 1969. Is this statement borne out by facts?

At a time when the whole world had got together to see what could be done about bringing pressure to bear on both Israel and South Africa — particularly the latter — to make them or force them to abandon their abnoxious policies Japan — and she had been a party to many a United Nations resolution calling on South Africa to force it to abandon its apartheid policies — contrary to all expectations, rather than joining in the sanctions campaign, in-

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

creased her trade with the apartheid regime as well as with Israel. Many observers saw this as both deceitful and immoral. The Japanese alone have experienced the devastations of nuclear warfare. Nevertheless, for money and money alone, they appear quite ready to assist in strengthening some of the most odious, most vile regimes mankind has ever known, Israel and South Africa, so that they can continue with their base policies of racial tyranny. Not only is Japan seriously involved in doing business with both Israel and South Africa, but her trade with the latter has increased, over the past few years, to such a level that she has surpassed South Africa's long standing partners, the United States of America.

“Japan has now overtaken the US as South Africa's main trading partner. According to official figures issued in Tokyo, two-way trade between Japan and South Africa totalled US\$1.9 billion dollars in the first month of 1987, while US-South African trade, according to US statistics, was US\$1.2 billion dollars. In 1986, the US had edged out Japan as South Africa's main trading partner, with trade figures that year of US\$3.63 billion dollars, fractionally ahead of the Japan South Africa level of US dollar 3.6 billion. . . Japan's main purchases from South Africa are coal, precious metals, strategic metals and minerals. Japanese business people and investors would generally be reluctant to reduce the level of many of these deals. In some other cases, where alternative supplies are reasonably easily available, Japan prefers to maintain a South Africa link. This is because it likes to have as many supply options as possible and because South Africa's need for exports reduce its bargaining power. Japanese officials like to point out that they were years ahead of the US and Europe in imposing trade restraints on South Africa . . . but not trade credits — and exports of military equipment. In practice, though, these curbs were not as harsh as they might have sounded. . . Japanese companies were certainly willing to provide financial backing for South African owned businesses producing Japanese goods under licence or importing them directly. This has been crucial

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

to Toyota South Africa. . . All Japan's big nine trading houses have representative offices in South Africa. These are Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Marubeni, Sumitomo, Nissan-Iwai, C Itoh, Nichimen, Tomen and Kanematsu. The Japan external trade organization (Jeto) also has an office in Johannesburg."*

South Africa discriminates against Chinese on the basis of race, but not against people of the same race, the Japanese. It is easy to see why. In South Africa, Japanese are accorded a superior racial status to that accorded the Chinese. They are "honorary whites". Southern African states and, indeed, the Frontline States, should know that when South Africa bullies them, threatens them with reprisals should they support liberation movements in the sub-region or undermines their political systems, she does all these partly strengthened by the comfort she derives from the very lucrative trade links she has with Japan. The French say: "Les amis de mes amis sont mes amis; mais les amis de mes ennemis sont mes ennemis," (the friends of my friends are my friends, but the friends of my enemies are my enemies).

Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman, Yasser Arafat, arrived in Tokyo on 1 October, 1989, for a visit. While there, he made a personal appeal to the Japanese Government to recognize the newly proclaimed state of Palestine. However, the Japanese Government were unlikely to go as far as recognizing the state of Palestine, but were likely to give support to what they called "moderate" policies pursued by Mr. Arafat and the PLO in recent times. Mr Arafat also told his hosts that he believed that the problems of Palestine should be resolved along the same lines as the Namibian Peace Plan. He appealed to the Japanese authorities to cut off trade links with Israel and warned that it would be suicidal for a country that for two thirds of its oil imports, depended on Arab countries, to ignore six million Palestinians. Japanese trade with Israel had increased to such a level, over the past few years that Japan had become one of Israel's most important trading partners, surpassed only by the United States and Britain.

* (SOUTH Magazine — March 1988.p.48)

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

To many people in the Third World, the Japanese appeared to be a people that would do anything for money or wealth as; perhaps, was supported by the many financial scandals that had rocked the Japanese society and brought several of its governments to sudden ends, particularly in 1989. To protect itself from attacks in the Third World, especially from African governments, Japan had worked out a programme of aid to these governments, which consisted mainly in free gifts of machinery, mostly radio and television equipment as well as motor vehicles. Ironically, Southern African countries constituted the main market for Japanese motor vehicles assembled in South Africa.

Those governments in the world, which support what everybody regards as evil, namely the repressive regimes of Israel and South Africa, of course, have reasons for doing so. But whatever these reasons, they cannot escape the moral responsibility of perpetuating racial tyranny in the Middle East and South Africa. These governments are a party to the Palestinian and South African tragedy.

History is full of examples of men who, having abused or denigrated man's importance by killing or taking human life, were reduced to absolute wretchedness. This was inevitable, it is believed, because God, the author of human life, which is derived from his own life, will not allow anyone to tamper with it with impunity. Thus Napoleon Bonaparte, Hitler, Mussolini and, nearer home Verwoerd, the author of Sharpeville and many other atrocities against the black people of South Africa and Namibia; Ian Smith, the man who said he would never see black rule in Rhodesia where he now lives in independent Zimbabwe. They all ended up miserably, having reigned supremely. These men and many others of their ilk, represented forces that were, for a time, irresistible and invincible. But, in the end they crumbled because they offended against the law that upheld the sacredness of man's life on this earth, as decreed by the Supreme Being, universally acknowledged by men as God. They had their moments of triumph and joy but somewhat disconsolate at the very loss their opponents or enemies had suffered at their very hands. They were held in suspense by a feeling of triumph and defeat, as Adolf Hitler was after his armies had flattened virtually the whole of Western

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

Europe, but England eluded him, unprepared for war as she was, and the Germans probably knew this. But, what do they do? Like a thief in hiding, with a large number of stolen pieces of porcelain, trying to find a suitable position for his hiding, inadvertently steps on one, the crackling noise thereof revealing his vulnerability and exposing him to possible capture and surrender; fidgety, Hitler made one step of incalculable consequences. He marched against Russia, despite the non-aggression pact between her and his country signed barely two years earlier. Indeed, tyrants represent systems of administration that have no regard for treaties, as is evidenced by the behaviour of South Africa and Israel in the world of treaties and human understanding. The South African Government, true to its tyrannical nature, on 2 October, 1989, tried to overturn the Namibian independence plan by making an unfounded allegation that SWAPO guerrillas had been sighted entering Namibia from their bases in Southern Angola, to which, by an agreement signed between the United Nations, Angola and South Africa, they had been confined. Pretoria then decided to place its troops on alert, thereby scaring the Namibian populace, only five days before the elections that SWAPO was widely expected to win, opening the road to Namibian independence in 1990.

By his campaign against Russia, Hitler bit more than he could chew. His troops were certainly better drilled and better equipped against anything the Soviets could boast of, but Hitler came unstuck and that spelt doom for the Third Reich. He ended up the same way as all tyrants who trample down man's freedom and dignity, an absolute wretch.

Israel and South Africa are treading the same path as Nazi Germany did; towards self-destruction. Unless they make timely amends, they will, likewise, crumble because of the injustices they have committed against man, God's own sacred creature.

To give this point greater emphasis, I shall cite a very recent occurrence in East Europe, which is, at the same time, a very sad development indeed. On 26 December, 1989, Romanian television was reported to have shown the bodies of the executed former President and absolute ruler, Nicolae Ceausescu and his wife, Elena. The Ceausescus were executed by firing squad on 25 December, 1989, following trial by a military tribunal. They were accused of

Why Israel and South Africa Must Fail

grave crimes against the state, some of which were: genocide or deaths of almost 7 000 Rumanians, subversion and destruction of the national economy.

Nicolae Ceausescu who presided over the affairs of Rumania for twenty-four years with an iron fist, was widely accused of serious violations of human rights for which his government was also severely criticized or condemned in many parts of the world, including East Europe where Rumania under Ceausescu alienated nearly all her neighbours. Ceausescu was not to be moved by whatever criticism or even condemnation was levelled against his country. He remained uninfluenced even by the current wave of dramatic changes sweeping East Europe. Trouble first flared up in the town of Timisoara in Western Rumania, where security forces opened fire on a crowd of demonstrators only a few days before the downfall of Ceausescu, killing a large number of them. Ceausescu's death was greeted with jubilation by the Rumanian masses. His end at the hands of the very people he led, was reminiscent of that of Benito Mussolini in April, 1945.

Four

THE AMANDLA AND INTIFADA UPRISINGS

Amandla in Zulu, one of the principal languages spoken by the black peoples of South Africa, means "power". Amandla is often used by the black peoples of South Africa as a political slogan symbolizing their power over the forces of foreign domination and colonialism. I have, therefore, decided to call the uprising by the black peoples of South Africa from 1984 to 1986, "Amandla Uprising". The period 1984–1986 saw the peak of the uprising, and by no means the end, as the struggle by the oppressed masses of South Africa continues. On the other hand Intifada is a more familiar term which is the Arab word for the uprising by Palestinian Arabs in the occupied territories of Palestine. Intifada began towards the end of 1987 and, like the Amandla uprising or revolution, continues. As has already been discussed, the two peoples, namely the Africans or black peoples of South Africa and Palestinian Arabs fight a common enemy, racial tyranny, represented by Zionism in Palestine and apartheid in South Africa. Zionism and apartheid are seen here as two faces of one and the same coin.

I shall begin with a resume of events that made up the Amandla uprising, for the sake of chronology, for it occurred earlier than the Intifada.

I have briefly recounted the events leading up to the uprising by the black peoples of South Africa from 1984 to 1986 in another book.

As expected, the authorities in South Africa reacted to the uprising with appalling brutality. They replied by declaring two states

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

of emergency in a space of about twelve months. Heavily armed troops were sent into African townships to reinforce police units already there for the purposes of striking terror into the hearts of residents who would thus be intimidated into surrender. Orders were issued to the troops and police to open fire at the slightest sign of trouble. All anti-apartheid and, therefore, anti-government protests, whatever form they took, were banned, and where this was not heeded, were suppressed with brutal ruthlessness. Thousands of anti-apartheid activists, who included children, were shot or thrown into indefinite detention, where many of them still are at this moment (1989). To stop the news about what was taking place from reaching the outside world, Government clamped down on all means of mass communication, radio, television, newspapers and magazines. Even private mail was tampered with. Nobody was allowed to report or cover anything relating to the uprising, except with the express permission of the Government, which was rarely if ever granted at all. Many foreign journalists were arrested and thrown out of the country or were subjected to constant police surveillance and harassment. Public gatherings such as funeral processions, wedding receptions and, in some cases, even church services, were banned. South Africa had, to all intents and purposes, become a police state. Undaunted, the African people fought back, very often armed with nothing but stones. There was death, havoc and destruction on a scale unheard of hitherto. Thousands of people, mostly Africans, were killed in the pitched battles that occurred almost everyday in the townships which had come under siege.

It was during this period more than any other time that urban guerrilla activity by the African liberation organizations, particularly the African National Congress, was stepped up to such a degree that not even the authorities in South Africa could hide its effectiveness. Alarmed, South Africa responded by sending its troops across the borders into neighbouring countries to silence what Pretoria often described as "terrorist bases" of the ANC in these countries. Often, the "terrorist bases" were, in fact, refugee camps that had been set up for the thousands of South African black refugees who had run away from the apartheid tyranny. South Africa always maintained that the refugee camps were, as a matter

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

of fact, bases of the ANC guerrillas, which had been established with the knowledge and assistance of the governments in the countries concerned. She, therefore, reserved the right to strike back at the bases that threatened her security regardless of what governments in the neighbourhood might say. As far as South Africa was concerned these governments had allowed the ANC "terrorists" to set up the bases and should, therefore, be treated as accomplices in the acts of "terrorism" that the ANC perpetrated in South Africa.

Not a single country in the neighbourhood was spared these vile intrusions which resembled those carried out by Israel into neighbouring Arab countries, particularly Lebanon which she invaded in 1982 to, as the Israelis put it; "clear the area of the PLO terrorists."

South Africa paid particular attention to her borders with Angola and Mozambique, where she was most vulnerable to guerrilla penetration by African freedom fighters of SWAPO and the ANC. There was no common border between South Africa proper and Angola, but South Africa worried about Namibia to which she had extended her rule, declared illegal by the United Nations, where she was involved in a mortal strife with SWAPO guerrillas who had taken up arms to end Pretoria's illegal occupation. From their bases in Southern Angola, SWAPO had made repeated armed incursions into Northern Namibia, to South Africa's greatest discomfort. To ward off the threat posed by SWAPO, South Africa stirred up trouble for the organization by encouraging factional or tribal antagonism among the black peoples of Namibia, thus creating the impression that SWAPO belonged to one particular Namibian community which was trying to impose itself on all others in order to dominate them. Also, to blunt SWAPO's thrusts into Namibia, South Africa gave substantial military support to the Angolan rebel faction, UNITA, who were concentrated in the south-east of Angola. Israel, likewise, was supporting Christian Phalangists in Lebanon, to divide Arab resistance to its aggression in Lebanon itself and elsewhere.

In Mozambique, South Africa caused a diversion by organizing and supporting resistance to the Government in the form of Mozambique National Resistance or RENAMO rebels who vandalized

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

large areas of the country, indiscriminately killing people and wantonly destroying property. In time, the Government, worn out having just emerged from two colonial wars against the Portuguese and Rhodesians in support of African nationalists there, found its hands so tied that it spent nearly all its energies and resources to deal with this one problem. Moreover, there was the Nkomati non-aggression pact signed in 1984 between itself and the Government of South Africa that inhibited any serious involvement by Mozambique in the African uprising. Nevertheless, there was considerable guerrilla activity by African nationalists inside South Africa, something the Boers had always ruled out as impossible. Hence their retaliatory action against all neighbouring black states without exception, which South Africa held responsible for the guerrilla incursions into her territory.

For the first time in South Africa's history, there was considerable loss of life among the whites, and South Africa itself was turned into a battleground, with all sections of the non-white population joining in the fight against the apartheid enemy. However, South Africa was, once again, able to employ the diversionary tactics with some success by playing off two black organizations against each other. Thus members of the pro-ANC United Democratic Front (UDF) and those of the Inkatha Movement of the KwaZulu Bantu Homeland Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, which was regarded as pro-apartheid by the UDF, constantly fought each other, and hundreds of lives were lost on both sides, much to the Boers' greatest joy and comfort.

As South African troops and militants of African nationalism were locked in battle, the Organization of African Unity stepped up its campaign to isolate South Africa internationally and managed to win the support of most Third World nations, the British Commonwealth, the Communist Bloc and the Scandinavian nations in its appeal to the international community to impose economic sanctions against the Boer republic to force it to abandon the abnoxious racial apartheid policies which were the root-cause of all the turmoil and bloodshed in the country.

There were signs that the world-wide condemnation, the diplomatic boycotts and economic sanctions were having their desired effect as the South African Government began talking of initiating

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

a programme of political reform to accommodate non-whites, in particular, blacks. This led to a divergence of opinion among the Boers and some very strong feeling of betrayal in some quarters. Some thought — and these were very few indeed — that apartheid should be abolished, leading to the admission of non-whites to the Government machinery and to democratic power-sharing between blacks and whites. Another group thought that reforms should be introduced in the apartheid system to make it attractive and acceptable to the majority of the people of South Africa. However, the conservative right-wingers felt alarmed because, to them, it appeared that the Government was giving in too much to the demands of the non-whites, which might endanger their privileged position in the country and make the future for South Africa's white community uncertain. They, therefore, in a bid to stem the tide, advocated preservation of the status quo by adhering more strictly to the provisions of the apartheid system as well as stricter observance of all legislation dealing with racial discrimination. The result was a serious rift within the ranks of Boerdom. The white reformers sought and established contacts with leaders of African liberation movements, in particular the ANC, who were living in exile in neighbouring countries, in order to work out a formula for a reconciliation between the racial groups they represented. Dissent, hitherto unheard of, was loudly voiced everywhere in the white community, particularly among the Boers, who for many years had stuck together to preserve their racial identity and national cohesion. For the first time, the all-powerful National Party that had ruled South Africa since 1948, faced challenge from parties until then regarded as insignificant to which it also began to lose support, as was evidenced by the by-elections and municipal elections held between 1984 and 1988 as well as the general election held in 1989 (from which Africans were excluded) in which opposition parties made substantial gains at the expense of the Government. Indeed, it was largely these differences which led to the abrupt resignation of President Pieter Botha, in 1989, to be succeeded by Mr F.W. de Klerk who talked and behaved like a reformer.

Two nations, the United States of America and Great Britain, voiced their opposition to the economic sanctions campaign against South Africa, which was supported by the majority member na-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

tions of the United Nations. The Americans, under President Ronald Reagan, had worked out a policy towards South Africa, which they called Constructive Engagement by which they believed they could influence South Africa to abandon apartheid through persuasion, while the British led by Mrs Margaret Thatcher, believed that sanctions achieved nothing positive. They only helped to harden attitudes. In the South African context, sanctions, apart from hardening the Boer resolve to maintain apartheid and all it stood for, would hurt the very people they were meant to help, namely the blacks, more than they would whites. Against that background, the British would rather encourage dialogue between the white and black communities of South Africa than engage in anything punitive.

Thus the very people who had advocated sanctions against Rebel Rhodesia only twenty-five years previously were now sceptical of their efficacy. Mrs Thatcher was put to task by other heads of government of Commonwealth nations at their summit in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in October, 1989. She alone argued against the raising of any topic that had a bearing on the economic sanctions already applied against South Africa. She incurred the wrath and condemnation of other Commonwealth leaders when, towards the end of the summit, as a compromise to accommodate the British position, they all, including Mrs Thatcher, signed a document committing themselves to maintaining existing sanctions on South Africa, without calling for new ones. But the British Prime Minister, without consulting the other leaders, issued a separate statement of her own afterwards, and, referring to the earlier document, she said that it was "largely fruitless".

Other Commonwealth leaders took a very strong exception to this remark which some of them regarded as repudiation by the British Prime Minister of the declaration made earlier and denounced Mrs Thatcher. The President of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, referred to Mrs Thatcher's remarks as "despicable and unacceptable." But she stuck to her guns insisting that she had a right to comment on the document in question.

South Africa's President, F.W. de Klerk, said that he was pleased with Mrs Thatcher's spirited and principled stand. His Foreign

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Minister, Roelof Botha, said that the Commonwealth had no right to push South Africa into accelerating the pace of reform.

Mrs Thatcher, of course, had no particular love for those South African blacks whose interests she appeared to be fighting for. Her stand at the summit and, indeed, throughout her premiership on the question of economic sanctions being applied against South Africa to force her to abandon the apartheid policy could not have been motivated by any philanthropic sentiments for the suffering masses of Southern Africa. Rather, as is well known, Mrs Thatcher was motivated, as a British national, by her country's business interests in South Africa, which she would not like to see harmed by economic sanctions. Britain remains, to the present moment, one of South Africa's most important trading partners.

The United States of America and Great Britain are also Israel's principal backers whose support the Jewish state cannot do without. We have discussed the importance the two attach to both Israel and South Africa as outposts to promote and protect their political, economic and strategic interests in the Middle East and Southern Africa. It is not surprising, therefore, that these two powers should appear hostile or lukewarm towards initiatives to bring peace to the Middle East and Southern Africa, and, assured of their continued support and assistance, both Israel and South Africa regard yearly UN condemnation of their policies by the rest of the world as something they can afford to ignore. The result is that there has been no marked improvement in the political climate obtaining in either Israel or South Africa. The situation remains tense and unpredictable as racial strife and turmoil continue unabated, especially in Palestine.

It is generally accepted that there is a limit to what man can endure. Driven against the wall, man does tend to fight back; even against formidable odds. History has many examples of this. One example that readily comes to mind is the Warsaw Ghetto uprising against the German invaders during the Second World War, when, driven to desperation, starving and dying, outnumbered and outgunned and sometimes with their bare hands, the residents of the ghetto in Warsaw, Poland, rather than all of them perish, rose up against the Nazi invaders and accounted of themselves most commendably. But it was a forlorn and desperate attempt. Nearer

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

home, the Soweto uprising of 1976 involving black school children who, armed with nothing but stones and their bare hands, in the name of freedom and human dignity, confronted men armed with automatic rifles and machineguns, rather than succumb to a hated system of education. It is clear, the price man puts on freedom and human dignity is inestimable, if these and many other examples are anything to go by. That is to say whoever tampers with man's freedom and human dignity sets himself on a course for protracted and fierce resistance, as the world is witnessing in Palestine and South Africa.

The quest for independence, freedom and human dignity by the oppressed people of Palestine and South Africa increased with the accelerated tempo of the liquidation of colonialism and foreign rule over most of the globe. By the end of the seventies, with the exception of Palestine and Southern Africa (South Africa proper and Namibia), colonialism or foreign rule everywhere else had given way to independence, freedom and self-determination. Naturally, the Palestinians and the non-white peoples of South Africa had no wish to lag behind the rest of the world. They wished to be independent and free like everybody else. But they were up against systems of foreign domination that had anathematized any moves towards peaceful change. Fighting, therefore, became inevitable, as the only alternative was surrender, and this was out of the question.

One point that needs emphasizing is that both Palestinians and black peoples of South Africa, rather than fight, were quite willing to involve themselves in dialogue with their adversaries, to seek a way to settle their differences peacefully. But they reserved the right to take up arms and fight should that fail. Neither Israel nor South Africa was in a mood for dialogue of the kind advocated by the Palestinians or Africans. Israeli and South African understanding or interpretation of dialogue, in effect, amounted to asking the opposition camps to capitulate. For both Israel and South Africa insisted that for any dialogue to take place between themselves and the opposition, the latter had to make a unilateral renunciation of violence or terrorism as means of bringing about change. This was more South Africa's position in recent years than Israel's. The Jewish state had haughtily and emphatically ruled out any talks

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

between itself and the PLO because the latter was a "terrorist" organization. Many people thought this was being unreasonable on the part of the Israelis, to say the least; because the question of who was and who was not a terrorist in the context of the Palestinian impasse was, as we have seen, a highly contentious one. Besides, the PLO was the mouthpiece of the people of Palestine. It was, indeed, up to the Palestinians to determine who should speak for them. Who were the Israelis to argue otherwise? The PLO represented the people of Palestine. It was as simple as that. Therefore, refusing to do business with them was refusing to do business with the Palestinians. Israel's and South Africa's attitude towards efforts to seek a peaceful solution of the problems in their respective regions did not fool anyone, of course. The world was convinced as to who wanted peace and who did not. For their part, the forces of national liberation in both Palestine and Southern Africa as well as the oppressed masses in both places were resolved to go in action, whatever the cost — and they did.

The Intifada and Amandla uprisings had many features in common. Some of these were: both were, first and foremost, nationalist; both were popular and spontaneous uprisings against intolerable racial oppression and humiliation; both involved large numbers of unarmed civilians who were prepared to die to achieve independence, freedom and human dignity for their people; both involved large numbers of children many of whom were killed or detained; both were characterized by a large measure of self-denial and sacrifice on the part of participants or volunteers; both met brutal armed reprisals; both aroused sympathy and a strong feeling of solidarity in the Third World, especially among people who were once colonized; both were expressions of opposition to systems of racial oppression and arrogance, Zionism and apartheid, whose indefensible nature they did much to expose.

The following are instances of Israeli and South African repressive rule in the occupied territories of Palestine and in South Africa, which clearly show the brutal and morally indefensible nature of Israeli occupation of Arab land and the policy of white supremacy in South Africa.

Unless otherwise stated, the source of news regarding events during the Intifada and Amandla uprisings is BBC news broadcasts.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

On the endless legislation by the Government of South Africa against the opponents of apartheid, particularly blacks, Albert Luthuli once said:

“A catalogue of the South African Parliament’s Acts of oppression makes dreary and exhausting reading. There seems to be no end to them. There are so many that the mind loses count of their number and grasp of their effects. But with each one, people are further injured and degraded.” (Albert Luthuli— *LET MY PEOPLE GO*. Fontana Books. p.135).

Some of the Acts Luthuli had in mind are: the Suppression of Communism Act aimed at communists or Communism; the Riotous Assemblies Act, designed to frustrate organized resistance to apartheid; the Criminal Law Amendment Act and the Public Safety Act were introduced to deal with the ANC-organized Defiance Campaign in 1952; the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act made strikes by Africans illegal and excluded Africans from participating in any activities that promoted the economic well-being of South Africa beyond their labour; the Separate Amenities Act excluded Africans from all social amenities enjoyed by whites; the South-West African Administration Act threw the African people of Namibia into the apartheid system of South Africa, whether they wished it or not; the Industrial Conciliation Act placed the settlement of all industrial disputes in the hands of the Government of South Africa, etc., etc. The sum total of these acts falls short of, the mind trembles to imagine, “the Seeing, Smelling, Hearing, Tasting and Touching Amendment Act”, to ban African use of bodily senses. No exaggeration. The reality is very close to this.

The African people in South Africa count for so little that members of the white ruling class do not have any difficulty in answering questions regarding the welfare of black people. For example, President Pieter Botha was asked at the beginning of February, 1987, whether the Government would consider admitting blacks to Parliament, as they had done coloureds (people of mixed race) and Indians. He did not even have to beat about the bush. He replied that that would never happen. But answers such as this one, do not always indicate that whites are sure what the future may have in store for them, as the experience of African nationalists in Zimbabwe would bear witness. In Zimbabwe, then Rhodesia,

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

many white extremists, none more notable than the Prime Minister himself, Ian Douglas Smith, used to boast, after they had seized power illegally in 1965, that there would be no black majority rule in their country for as long as they lived. This, as we now know, was completely unrelated to what the African freedom movement had in store for the country. White Rhodesia fell to the African guerrillas of the Zimbabwe National Union (ZANU) and those of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) acting together, and became the independent and sovereign state of Zimbabwe in 1980. Ian Smith and his cohorts were forced to eat their words.

The conditions under which the Amandla detainees were held was a matter of grave concern to members of their families, many of whom did not even know where their relatives were held, let alone under what conditions. Fears were expressed about the safety of the detainees in view of South Africa's horrifying record of brutality to political prisoners. It was with this in mind that member of the opposition, Mrs Helen Suzman, using her parliamentary privilege, because she would be breaking the law otherwise, revealed that more than 100 people detained under the state of emergency had been beaten and tortured, one of them only twelve years old. Many Palestinian twelve-year-olds suffered the same at the hands of the Israelis during the Intifada.

It is interesting to note that, comparatively speaking, whites in Southern Africa have fared a lot better after independence has been won than Africans have under colonialism, clearly demonstrating that the Africans have not fought white people for freedom and human dignity out of any hard racial feelings or malice, but out of a principled conviction that, as human beings, they were entitled to independence and freedom like anybody else. Judging on the basis of the fact that Palestinians and Jews had lived together for hundreds of years before and after Christ, in Palestine, long before the Zionists arrived, one would not hesitate to conclude that Palestinians would not eject Jews from their country after independence and freedom are won, provided the latter desisted from looking upon themselves as a special people. This is what makes freedom such a noble ideal, that people cease to be classified according to race, colour of their skins, religious beliefs or any other con-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

sideration. They are just people, and nothing else. No wonder it has often been stated by many a sage that freedom cannot be reconciled with discrimination against man on any grounds whatsoever, for discrimination masks fear, more than anything else and, of course, where there is fear, there is no freedom. In other words, those countries which practise racial or any other form of discrimination against man, cannot be said to be truly free. But the "Free World" encompasses many areas that are torn by racial discrimination, tension and strife: South Africa, Israel, to mention only two. In what sense is the "Free World" free?

It is the Third World, having shaken off colonialism and racial prejudice, that is teaching the world what appears to be the true meaning of freedom and humanity. For example, President Kaunda on 25 February, 1987, addressed a press conference at State House in Lusaka, at which he announced the release from detention, of four young white South Africans apprehended by Zambian security forces in 1986 following a South African air raid on Lusaka. The young men were produced and brought before the gathering at the conference which was also attended by the parents of two of them, who had pleaded with the President for the young men's release. The Government of South Africa had also pleaded for the release of the young men, said the President, but, "naturally" he had refused. The President who was touched by the pleas of the parents agreed to have the detainees released because he was convinced the parents told the truth. The four had denied that they were spies of South Africa. They said that they had set out from South Africa as tourists and were later approached by South African security men.

How many Zambian young men caught by South African security forces in similar circumstances would get away so lightly? And, would Israelis release PLO youths caught by their security forces in similar circumstances?

Relations between South Africa and nearly all neighbouring black states were such that a virtual war situation existed, particularly after South African planes attacked three of the black states in Pretoria's neighbourhood in 1986, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia. Then, the atmosphere became so tense that when Ghana in West Africa, celebrated the 30th Anniversary of her independence

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

on 6 March, 1987, President Kaunda, an elder statesman of Africa, stayed away because he had information that South Africa intended to attack Zambia during his absence.

Over the past few years, the Government of South Africa has, time and again, stated that it is willing to meet representatives of African liberation movements such as the African National Congress on the proviso that the liberation movements renounce the use of violence to bring about change. The African people, it must be stressed, are not the source of the violence that has shaken South Africa in recent years; nor are they violent by disposition. Violence is something they, therefore, do not desire, for its own sake. They are up against a system of administration that has adamantly and consistently refused to allow the African masses a say in the affairs of their country; affairs which, indeed, concern their very existence as human beings. It has refused to listen to repeated representations made by the African people themselves through their chosen political organs such as the African National Congress or the Pan African Congress that they be allowed a say and participation in the running of the country, after all they form the overwhelming majority of the total population of the country. Africa, on behalf of the black peoples of South Africa, has appealed to the authorities in Pretoria to create opportunities that would make it possible for the majority of the people in the country to not only have a say in the affairs of their country, but also to take part in electing those who should represent them in Parliament, consistent with their numbers and in keeping with the principles of democracy, which the Government of South Africa, indeed, espouses. The United Nations have repeatedly reminded the South African Government of the dire necessity of admitting Africans to the Government machinery and warned that she would be excluded from participating in world affairs that benefit the human race, if she did not do that. The Government in Pretoria has chosen to give a deaf ear to all this, and, in consequence incurred the wrath of not only the black peoples of South Africa, but of the entire human race as well.

At first, the African people adopted a peaceful approach in their dealings with the Government in Pretoria. But, the futility of this was brought home to their understanding when the Nationalists

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

in South Africa came to power in 1948. They slammed shut the door to peaceful entreaties by the Africans and, after Sharpeville in 1960, left no one in doubt as to what the Africans should expect from then on. It was war and nothing else. War was declared on the African people by the Government, and not the other way round. This is the war that is going on now. Who then, is responsible for the violence that has rent to shreds the South African society? The answer is simple enough.

To test the credibility of the Government of South Africa all the same, Archbishop Desmond Tutu of Cape Town, one of the most respected religious leaders of South Africa and of the black community, flew out in March, 1987, to Lusaka, Zambia, to meet leaders of the ANC, living there in exile. He urged the ANC to renounce violence in order to see how serious the Government of South Africa were about dialogue, if the ANC renounced violence. ANC President, Oliver Tambo, told him that the organization would not renounce violence or armed struggle so long as repression in South Africa continued, while leaving the door open for dialogue.

Almost simultaneously, United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, called for a halt to repression and violence in South Africa and appealed for negotiations among representatives of all communities in the country in order to put an end to racial discrimination. He said: "The system has exacted a heavy price in blood and it is a threat to South Africa's future, to the stability and prosperity of the region and to international peace and security." But, to South Africa, as to Israel, the United Nations did not mean much. However, there were men within the Boer community whose consciences were certainly disturbed by their country's persistent disregard for world opinion. Such men, of course realized that the policies their Government pursued in defiance of world opinion, would only lead to disaster as had happened in other parts of the world. They knew too that it was futile to try and persuade their Government to abandon some of these policies for which South Africa incurred world-wide condemnation. So they took the only course open to them, and that was to resign from the ruling National Party. One such man was a prominent Afrikaner, David de Villiers, who resigned from the National Party to join the then swelling ranks of the independents many of whom advocated re-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

forms in the apartheid system. Until then de Villiers was director of the biggest Afrikaans-language press group, the *Nasionale Pres*. The CAPE TIMES described de Villiers's resignation as a bomb shell. Other prominent figures to have resigned from the National Party were former South African Ambassador to the United Kingdom, Dr. Denis Worrall, and former National Party politician, Wyndand Malan.

The South African situation, the centre of which at the time was the Amandla uprising, had ramifications in neighbouring countries, as we have seen, and a serious spillover in Angola and Mozambique, where the Government of South Africa was supporting rebel groups or factions against established governments in a bid to destabilize them and render them ineffectual. In Angola, the rebels, UNITA led by Jonas Savimbi, were fighting a bush war against the Central Government in Luanda. They had succeeded in laying waste large areas of the countryside, paralysing the economic infrastructure such as the Benguela Railway, roads and bridges; all to South Africa's instructions and those of her allies.

At the end of March, 1987, Jonas Savimbi announced, in Washington, that his organization might agree to the reopening of the Benguela Railway to the Atlantic coast, to ease tension between UNITA and the Government in Luanda, on the one condition that the railway was not to be used for military purposes. Savimbi was under instructions from his supporters in the United States and in Europe to give that concession, for the railway was of vital economic importance to Zambia and Zaire, both of which used it for transporting copper to the coast and thence to markets in Europe. The owners of the railway were anxious that this trade, disrupted by UNITA guerrillas, should resume as soon as possible. At that time, South Africa was trying to talk peace to her black neighbours, while hiding a stick behind her back and with the blood of thousands of black people on her hands. Her neighbours, of course, did not and could not respond favourably. She reacted in the manner expected of her — more acts of destabilization.

On 9 April, 1987, a bomb blast killed three Botswana citizens in the capital city, Gaborone. The bomb had been planted in a minibus bearing a South African number plate. Earlier, on 8 April, 1987, South African Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha, had an-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

nounced that a large band of heavily armed ANC guerrillas had assembled in Lusaka, Zambia, in readiness for departure to South Africa where they had been instructed to disrupt the whites-only general election that was to take place shortly. He said that South Africa had contacted governments in the neighbourhood to stop the ANC from embarking on that mission and warned that his Government would act against any government that aided the ANC's mission.

Elsewhere in the world; President Ronald Reagan of the United States and Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, addressed a joint press conference in Washington after they had signed a treaty on 10 December, 1987, to ban medium range nuclear missiles. There was noticeable thaw in world tension given rise to by the competition in nuclear superiority between the two super-powers, during the few months immediately following this. The world at large was pleased at this happy development and congratulated the two leaders. But, was this a real step towards banning nuclear weapons altogether, first by the two and then by the whole world? Could this be taken as a sign that there would soon be peace all over the world?

In December, 1987, a few days after the world had congratulated Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev on the signing of the treaty to ban medium range nuclear missiles, widespread unrest broke out in the Israeli occupied territories of Palestine, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Israeli troops were accused of brutalities against Palestinians, several of whom they had killed after indiscriminately shooting into groups of Arabs. The Arabs responded by rioting, demonstrating against the shootings and by withdrawing their labour as well as by other forms of protest. The Israeli authorities became more brutal, and there was increased indiscriminate shooting of Arab demonstrators and strikers, hundreds of whom were arrested and taken to detention camps. Many others were beaten up and tortured. Under pretext of looking for Arab or Palestinian "terrorists", Israeli soldiers, driving bulldozers, demolished several houses belonging to Palestinians in the city of Nablus on the West Bank. The world was alarmed and condemned Israeli methods of quelling the riots or demonstrations. The Intifada had begun.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Did the Palestinians feel encouraged by the spirit of reconciliation in the Arab World that had manifested itself at the Arab League summit held in Amman, Jordan, a few weeks earlier in November, 1987?

Arab League members had met to discuss matters of common concern, among these, of course, the Middle East situation. Old enemies, particularly Syria and Iraq agreed or were persuaded to patch up their differences so that the Arab world could present a one united front in tackling their common problems, the most intractable of these being the Palestinian question. Several members present agreed to re-establish diplomatic relations with Egypt, severed in 1979, when President Anwar Sadat signed the Camp David Accord with Premier Menachem Begin of Israel, meant to end the state of war between their respective countries.

Meanwhile, the South African Government had come under tremendous pressure at home from the Amandla resisters and, abroad, from its military involvement in Angola and Namibia, from the Frontline States, from the Organization of African Unity and from the world at large, with calls for economic sanctions against the Boer republic growing louder and more emphatic with each day that passed. The result was that Pretoria became pretty restless and nervous about the whole ugly situation she had found herself in. In a bid to break out of this nasty and perplexing situation, South Africa resorted to stepping up her efforts in support of the Angolan UNITA rebels and the MNR insurgents in Mozambique in order to divert world attention from South Africa itself to these areas and thereby, to buy time. Accordingly, with the support they received from South Africa, the MNR rebels in Mozambique at the end of October, 1987, massacred about 200 people, all of them civilians, in an ambush north of Maputo. The people had been travelling in a convoy of about eighty vehicles when they suddenly came under fire from the rebels. Mozambique accused South Africa of having been behind the massacre, which Pretoria, of course, denied. But, only a short while later, both the BBC and the Voice of America on 31 October, 1987, reported South African troops having crossed into Southern Angola and killed about one hundred and fifty "SWAPO insurgents", for the loss of only eleven of their men. Then, reportedly, heavy fighting in the area

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

ensued between SWAPO and South African troops. On 3 November, 1987, South Africa admitted the death of one more man, which brought to twelve the number of their men killed in the fighting. Nine more South African soldiers were to die in the area around Cuito Cuanavale, which marked a turning point in South Africa's military involvement in Southern Angola and turned the tables against her throughout Southern Africa. The Namibian independence process was born out of this situation. The Bembas of Zambia say: "Mumbwe aitile mpashi, no kumububa shamububa." (the fox invited red ants, and they overwhelmed him). Later, South Africa admitted its involvement in the fighting on the side of UNITA. But SWAPO denied they had lost any men at all in the fighting in which they had not been involved at all. Later, South African President, Pieter Botha, visited the war zone, as did several of his ministers. Parallel to South Africa's involvement in Angola and Mozambique and her destabilization manoeuvres elsewhere in the Southern African sub-region was the Israeli cross-border military incursions into Southern Lebanon and her surreptitious flirting with certain Arab and African political leaders to win friends and, thereby, support, on the African continent as well as the Arab world and to divert world attention from what was happening in Israel itself. For instance, rumours circulated widely that Morocco intended to enter into dialogue with Israel with a view to establishing diplomatic relations in the same way as Egypt had done with the Jewish state. Simultaneously, a number of black African states, particularly in the French speaking parts of Africa, were in touch with Israel about re-establishing diplomatic relations broken off in 1973 at the time of the Yom Kippur War.

As the Presidential election in the United States drew closer and as the prospects that the Democrats might be returned grew brighter and in view of the ever increasing number of defections from the ruling National Party, the South African Government, clearly did not want to be caught napping. There were strong indications that the Democrats in the United States, if returned, would reverse American policy towards South Africa, as indeed was made clear by the party's leading spokesmen such as Michael Dukakis and Jesse Jackson. At home, the ruling National Party was losing support to the conservative right wing and to independents whose num-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

bers were steadily growing with defections from the party that occurred at an alarming rate. The calls for reforms by the independents grew louder with every day that ended, while, at the same time, calls for political rights by the non-white peoples of South Africa were made with an ever increasing seriousness and intensity. The South African Government soon faced something of a dilemma: whether to please the extreme conservative right wing or the section of the population that called for change or reform, namely the independents and blacks. But, having admitted coloureds (people of mixed race) and Indians to Parliament, in itself a step towards reform, the Government could not turn back and accommodate the extreme right wing or conservatives. There was no middle course to follow. Therefore, the Government fell in line with the reformers, but was careful enough not to alienate the Afrikaner community as a whole by taking precipitate action that was likely to alarm everybody. By the end of 1987, there was every indication that the Government intended to take measures aimed at reform or dialogue with the black majority, but would go about the whole business piecemeal. An indication of this was the frequent references to Nelson Mandela's possible release made by the South African President, Mr. Pieter Botha, between 1985 and 1989 when he ceased to be president. But he had made one significant step towards releasing all African nationalist held in prison for more than twenty years in most cases.

At the beginning of November, 1987, one of the ANC's stalwarts and leading African nationalists, Govan Mbeki, was released from imprisonment after twenty-three years. Mbeki was jailed, along with Nelson Mandela and several other leading ANC figures, in 1964, following the Rivonia trial, accused of plotting to overthrow the South African Government by violent means. Mbeki, who was seventy-seven at the time of his release, said that he had been released without any conditions and that he remained a member of the African National Congress, still committed to its goals. There was speculation that Mbeki's release might herald Mandela's. But this was contradicted a few days later by Mr. Botha in Cape Town.

Nevertheless, the authorities in South Africa were not quite convinced that they were doing the right thing. On 28 November,

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

1987, South African Police cancelled a rally that was to be addressed by the recently released Govan Mbeki. The rally had earlier been given a go-ahead by a local magistrate in Port Elizabeth, but police feared that it might lead to public disorder. A few days later, Mbeki was banned from addressing public gatherings because of his continued adherence to the goals and aims of the ANC. Undaunted, Mbeki stressed that he would continue to condemn apartheid and all it stood for.

Earlier, large numbers of South African Police had moved into Soweto, apparently to end the rent payment boycott by the residents of the township. The question of rent payment was a very sensitive one indeed in Soweto. Last time police had tried to intervene, twenty-one lives, all black, had been lost; mainly because South African Police did not hesitate to use firearms on Africans particularly protesters or demonstrators, whatever the circumstances.

The racially repressive measures taken by both Israel and South Africa against, respectively, Palestinian Arabs and Africans, are largely influenced by racial practices against non-white minorities in friendly countries of the West, especially those countries that from time to time speak or take measures against racialism in Israel and South Africa so that, should these countries continue to condemn Israeli or South African racial policies, their condemnation would quickly be denounced by both Jerusalem and Pretoria as hypocritical.

For example, in November, 1987, there were reports that many Australian Aborigines had died whilst in police custody for reasons that were not revealed. But according to reliable sources, the Aborigines were often picked up by police for such minor offences as loitering, arguing with police officers, disobedience to their employers (white), protesting against poor wages or conditions of employment such as poor food or accommodation and, especially, agitations for political rights. They were often detained, beaten up and tortured. Hence, of course, the deaths. The resemblance between this and the situation in South Africa and Israel affecting Africans and Arabs is quite apparent. Yet Australia is, on paper, one of the countries in the British Commonwealth of nations most vehemently opposed to racism. However, regarding the Aborigi-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

nes' deaths in police custody, the Australian Government was to conduct a commission of inquiry into the affair that had taken on the dimensions of a national scandal.

In January, 1988, Australia celebrated two hundred years or bicentenary of the arrival of white people there from Europe. But, Aborigines, several thousands of them, boycotted the celebrations and called 1988 the year of mourning for their ancestors who, they believed, were murdered by the invading whites.

Very often, when people debate racism at various international fora such as the United Nations and its agencies, they tend to bypass or overlook places such as Australia because of what is believed to be her contribution to the fight to rid the world of racism. Yet Australia has its own racial problems vis-a-vis relations between the Aborigines and whites or Government's concern over the welfare of the Aborigines. It is instances of racism in places such as Australia, the United States and Western Europe that encourage racist tendencies in both Israel and South Africa, for they give rise to the feeling "Oh, it can't be that bad; for it is done even in Australia, the United States and in Europe. We are not the only ones after all." Racism, as has already been discussed, is the most important factor in the Israeli or South African practices that dehumanize the Arab or African personality. For the sake of emphasis, I shall give further examples of racism in the Western World, that encourage racism in Israel and in South Africa.

Early in January, 1989, a black motor-cyclist was shot down and killed in Miami, United States. The incident sparked off riots there by blacks who protested the incident which they regarded as callous murder. The black motor cyclist, as often happens in the United States, was shot and killed by a white police officer for no apparent strong reason. During the same month and year, well-known liberal parliamentarian in South Africa, Mrs Helen Suzman, said in Parliament that she was going to table a motion demanding the removal of a High Court Judge, a Mr J.K. Strijdom, who gave a suspended sentence to a white farmer who had beaten a black labourer to death for killing his dog accidentally. The labourer ran over the farmer's dog with a tractor. Thereupon, the farmer tied him to a tree and beat him for two days until he died. Mrs Suzman described the sentence as "outrageously lenient." Parallel to

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

these two incidents was the shooting and killing of a Palestinian boy by Israeli soldiers in March, 1988, for merely carrying a Palestinian flag. Also, a postmortem on the Jewish girl (narrated earlier) killed on 6 April, 1988, near Nablus in the West Bank, revealed that the girl had been shot in the head as well as struck by a stone. The bullet had come from the same gun that had been used to kill two Palestinians in the same area, suggesting that the girl may have been shot by the same Israeli guard who earlier shot the two Palestinians; perhaps accidentally; or by the Palestinians who may have grabbed the gun from the guard after overpowering him. Who then killed the girl, her death referred to by Mr Shamir, who attended her burial, as a hideous crime which called for immediate and quick revenge?

Nothing could fan the fires of racism in both Israel and South Africa, the latter gripped by racial violence at the time, more than the wave of racial violence that swept right across Western Europe during the mid eighties.

“The wave of resentment against Third World immigrants and migrant workers is engulfing the rising numbers of political refugees arriving in Western Europe. Attacks on immigrants - with 160 racially motivated killings in France alone since 1981 - are only the ugliest symptom of an intolerance which permeates all levels of Western European societies. In the UK, the latest of a string of racist incidents was an attack by 40 white youths on three West Indians in a middle class area of South London, critically wounding one and disfiguring another. There were 112 attacks reported in a single London suburb (Redbridge) in 1985. In another, about half the immigrant population has been attacked . . . The recent series of terrorist blasts in European capitals has added more fuel to racist hysteria: in France every Arab is now regarded with suspicion. . . A Munich bar proclaims: ‘We only serve Germans’. And protestors outside temporary accommodation for asylum-seekers wave banners saying: ‘Throw out all foreigners’. In France 2.3 million immigrants and refugees from the Maghreb countries, francophone Africa, Turkey, and South-East Asia are portrayed as delinquents; Africans as thieves, dirty and vicious; Arabs as violent and arrogant, with their Islamic beliefs sin-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

gled out as a serious threat to European culture.” (SOUTH Magazine; Nov., 1986, p.17). “Arab now equals terrorist; Muslim equals terrorist; Palestinian equals terrorist. The Arab is portrayed (in Europe) as a person without a conscience, without human qualities. When you dehumanize a people, they can expect the worst.” — Adnan el Amad, Arab League. (Ibid. p.21)

The attitude of certain political leaders in the Western World did not help matters either. The Prime Minister of the West German state of Bavaria, Franz Josef Strauss, who was on a tour of Southern Africa in January, 1988, sparked off controversy when he said that he did not support the idea of black majority rule in South Africa. He added that no nation on earth had been as unfairly treated by world opinion as South Africa had been. Dr. Strauss, who met Angolan rebel leader, Jonas Savimbi, and had talks with representatives of the Mozambican Government, was widely denounced for his utterances on South African politics, which reflected his support for the regime. The South African authorities, as can be expected, seized upon the opportunity thus presented to appeal to the Western World for more support in what they called their fight against Communism and dictatorship, represented by the opponents of the apartheid system. Nevertheless, Dr. Strauss's words of encouragement to the South African Government were not much of a morale-booster.

On 5 February, 1988, President Botha of South Africa addressed Parliament and announced a package of measures to improve the economy in the face of international economic sanctions. He made only cursory references to the political situation in the country, but announced that several concerns were to go private, including transport, roads, electricity, etc. Meanwhile things were not going very well for the kingpin of the apartheid system, the Bantu Homelands.

On 10 February, 1988, the army in the Bophuthatswana Homeland staged a coup d'état against President Lucas Mangope whom they accused of election malpractices and corruption. This was the second coup affecting a Bantu homeland in two months. There was one earlier in December, 1987, in the Transkei for the same reasons. The coup was foiled by South African troops a few

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

hours after it had started, and President Botha visited the homeland to assure Lucas Mangope of South Africa's support. The South African Government suspected the ANC and the United Democratic Front of involvement in the coup.

And, to rub salt into South Africa's wounds, the independents, mostly former members of Mr. Botha's National Party, led by Dr. Denis Worrall, former South Africa's Ambassador to the United Kingdom, decided to form a political party of their own because they felt, in February, 1988, that they had marshalled enough support in the country to do this, as was proved by the results of the 1989 South African general election (from which blacks were excluded) in which they gained substantially at the expense of the ruling party.

It is believed in some quarters that those whom the gods are about to destroy, they first drive mad. Certainly, there did not appear to be very much sanity in most of the measures the South African Government took to deal with the very many problems it faced both at home, as a result of the Amandla uprising, and abroad, mainly as a result of economic sanctions and world-wide condemnation of its policies. A typical example of these measures was the banning by the Government, at the end of February, 1988, of 17 anti-apartheid organizations, among them the COSATU and the UDF. Two UDF officials, President Archie Gumede and co-President, Albertina Sisulu, were also banned. The move was condemned both in South Africa and abroad. Archbishop Desmond Tutu believed the Government was leading the country to war, an understatement. The black people of South Africa and the Government had been at war since 1948. Several anti-apartheid activists went underground to avoid arrest. Hardly a week later, the South African Police arrested a number of churchmen in Cape Town, who were about to present a petition to Parliament. The arrested churchmen were also briefly detained. They included Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Catholic Archbishop of Cape Town and Dr. Alan Boesak. They intended to protest against the clampdown on the 17 anti-apartheid movements a few days earlier. Police used water cannon against a number of other churchmen who also took part in the march to Parliament. In sharp contrast, the police did not intervene when Boer extremists in Pretoria demonstrated, a few days

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

earlier, demanding strict adherence to apartheid and the establishment of a separate state for the Boers.

More bannings of similar organizations were to follow as the government became more and more desperate.

Nor did the behaviour of the United States, Israel's and South Africa's principal backer in the West, help matters at all. By its behaviour and attitude towards small states in the neighbourhood, the United States certainly encouraged Israeli and South African bellicose nature. I have discussed this more in detail in another book.

On 17 March, 1988, President Ronald Reagan of the United States decided to send troops to Honduras, following reports that Nicaraguan troops had crossed into Honduras in hot pursuit of contra rebel troops. The United States airlifted more than 3 000 troops to Honduras, despite Nicaraguan denial of the allegation. On 16 March, 1988, a BBC report quoted a Honduran Government spokesman having denied that there had been any violations of Honduran territory by Nicaraguan troops. The United States move was seen by observers as a manoeuvre to get the Congress to change its mind over aid to the contras who were then in a hopeless situation as a result of Congress refusal of more aid to them. At the same time, the United States Government were at loggerheads with the Government of Panama as a result of an American indictment against Panamanian strongman, General Noriega, to answer charges of drug trafficking in American courts.*

This kind of behaviour, without any doubt, would encourage, Israel and South Africa to bully smaller and weaker states in their vicinity. Nor did it contribute much towards a more sane and humane approach by the South African authorities towards problems arising from the confrontation between the Government and the black peoples of South Africa, particularly during the Amandla uprising.

The South African Supreme Court sat on 17 March, 1988, to examine fresh evidence regarding the case of six young blacks, five men and one woman, known as the Sharpsville Six sentenced to death

*The Americans did invade Panama on 20 December, 1989, to capture General Noriega.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

in 1985 for the murder in 1984 of the Deputy Mayor of Sharpville. The six were due to hang the following day, unless the Supreme Court ruled otherwise. There had been worldwide indignation and condemnation, particularly in the Third World which looked upon the case as more manifestation of the white man's injustice against the non-white races of South Africa.. Pleas for clemency had been made by eminent personalities who included President Ronald Reagan of the United States, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, Chancellor Helmut Kohl of West Germany, Mr. Jacques Chirac, Prime Minister of France and Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations to President Botha who said that he did not see any basis for clemency for the six, despite the fact that it had been established during the trial of the six that they were not directly involved. Their conviction was based merely on the fact that they were part of the group which murdered the Deputy Mayor and, therefore, shared the blame with those who did the actual killing.

However, the Sharpeville Six were granted a month's stay of execution. Their lawyer was given until 18 April, 1988, to prepare his case on the basis that a key witness gave false evidence because, he alleged, he was under pressure from the police.

And a bomb exploded, almost simultaneously as the Supreme Court processed the Sharpeville Six case, near a court building in Krugersdorp, killing three people, all of them black - one of them a policeman. About twenty other people were injured, most of them white. The Government blamed the ANC for the blast. On 28 March, 1988, South African commandos shot and killed four people in the Botswana capital city of Gaborone, saying that the four were members of the banned ANC and belonged to the organization's "terrorist" group responsible for many an attack on South African territory. The Botswana Government denied this, saying that two of the four were Botswana citizens; one was a South African refugee; while the identity of the fourth was uncertain.

Since the early eighties, South Africa had embarked on a policy of pursuing its opponents right into their sanctuaries abroad. Thus Ruth First, a woman ANC supporter, paid with her life whilst on ANC assignments in Mozambique in 1982, when a bomb hidden in a parcel sent to her from South Africa exploded and killed her.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Another woman, ANC Paris representative, was murdered on 29 March, 1988. The ANC believed that this move by the enemy was aimed at eliminating the organization's leadership abroad, thereby depriving it of contacts with the outside world and a voice in international relations, which, in the end, would result in less pressure being exerted on South Africa from without. Pretoria quickly denied any involvement and blamed the murder on the ANC itself, which, Pretoria added, was torn by factional infighting.

On 7 April, 1988, the South African authorities issued a statement to the effect that they believed that one of the victims of their attack on 28 March, 1988, in Gaborone, Botswana, was Solomon Molefe, an ANC activist, wanted in South Africa for masterminding several "terrorist" attacks on the Boer republic. But, the Botswana Government denied this, saying that the man was in fact, Charles Mokoena, a South African refugee.

Israeli commandos, on 16 April, 1988, murdered Abu Jihad in Tunis. Abu was one of the PLO's top leaders and one of the closet associates of Chairman Yasser Arafat. By murdering Abu Jihad, the Israelis who accused him of masterminding many "terrorist" attacks against them and their Government, were, like the Boers in South Africa with regard to the ANC, trying to eliminate the PLO leadership or intimidate the organization into surrender.

There were moments when it was not clear what was going on in the minds of the South African authorities, for, now they sounded somewhat conciliatory; then suddenly they released their troops to kill or maim unarmed African civilians. One thing clear, however, was that the Government was walking a very tight rope, with one eye on "reforms", while the other was watching discontented and rebellious Boers, unhappy with their Government's seemingly conciliatory attitude towards Africans whom, it appeared to them, it was doing everything to try and please at their expense.

President Botha of South Africa certainly stirred up a hornet's nest when towards the end of April, 1988, he announced that the Government intended to include blacks in the exercise of choosing the President, which meant, in effect, admitting blacks to Parliament. The plan was at once condemned by the leader of the Right Wing opposition, Dr. Andries Treurnicht, who believed that, if implemented, the plan would spell doom for white hold on power

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

and white supremacy. On the other hand, blacks believed that for the plan to have any meaning at all, jailed leaders of the black majority should be released so that they could take part in the negotiations to determine who should represent blacks.

The Israelis were not having a very comfortable time either, as the Intifada progressed. Looking for scapegoats, the Israelis, at the beginning of May, 1988, sent their troops across the border into Southern Lebanon to strike at pockets of resistance there or what they called "terrorist camps". They clashed with the Shi'ite Amal militiamen. In the ensuing battle, three Israeli soldiers were killed, while the Shi'ite lost thirty of their men. The Israelis moved up to only a few kilometres from where Syrian troops were deployed in the Bekaa Valley. Surprisingly, no clashes occurred between the two.

Elsewhere in the world, President Ronald Reagan of the United States arrived in Moscow on 29 May, 1988, for discussions with Mr Mikhail Gorbachev and the Soviet Government. He met Jewish and other Soviet dissidents wishing to leave the Soviet Union. Human rights featured most prominently in the talks between the two representatives of super-power states with Mr Reagan insisting that the Soviet Union should rehabilitate several well-known dissidents in exile. On democracy, Mr Reagan pointed out that people should be able to say: "This is the government we want." How many people in Israel and South Africa, both supported by the United States, would agree with Mr Reagan regarding democracy in these parts of the world? How many Arabs living in Israel; and how many non-white people in South Africa would say of the government in either: "this is the government we want"? Yet Mr Reagan was trying to impress it upon Mr Gorbachev that he came from a world that cherished freedom founded upon democratic principles. Against the background of what is happening today in the Soviet Union itself and in Eastern Europe, Mr Reagan would not have much to say on "democracy", if he were to return to Moscow. How democratic would the Americans appear to be, backing Israel and South Africa, both tyrannical and, without doubt, undemocratic, in the face of recent developments in Poland, the Baltic states, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia? Nothing similar to these developments has ever taken place in either

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Israel or South Africa, parts of the "free" and "democratic" world, where the rights of the majority count for nothing, simply because they are not of the same hue or race as the members of the ruling class.

At the beginning of June, 1988, hundreds of thousands of black workers in South Africa went on strike to protest against proposed new harsh labour laws and Government clampdown on 17 anti-apartheid organizations earlier in the year. The strike was reported most effective in Johannesburg, the centre of which a BBC correspondent described as "ghost town". This was the most serious work stoppage in South Africa's labour history. As expected, there was violence and loss of life. Another strike took place in August, 1988, involving black South African mine workers, about 400 000 of whom refused to go to work. It was feared the mining industry might be paralysed.

As the year 1988 drew to a close, speculation increased that the jailed black nationalist leader, Nelson Mandela, might be released. However, the Government of South Africa had other plans. Rather than release him outright, the Government of South Africa moved Mandela out of hospital in Cape Town where he had been undergoing treatment for tuberculosis for nearly three weeks to a private clinic. This was at the beginning of September, 1988. Later, Mandela was visited by South African Justice Minister, Kobbie Coetzee. The subject of their discussion was not revealed. Earlier, hinting at Government plans for Mandela's release, President Botha said that it would be unwise of Mandela if he had to return to prison after treatment.

Many South African whites had become disenchanted with the Government, particularly over its handling of the Amandla uprising and lack of "reforms" which were necessary if their country was to brush off the stigma of an international pariah. Several prominent white South Africans, particularly intellectuals, churchmen, students and leaders of sport organizations had established contacts with representatives of black nationalist organizations, in particular the ANC, seeking what they called, "national reconciliation." Accordingly, the ANC met South African rugby chief in Harare, Zimbabwe, in October, 1988, in order to end apartheid in the sport so that South Africa could, once again, compete internationally. The meeting was condemned by right-wing leader, Dr.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Andries Treurnicht and Government officials. Soon after, the ANC had another meeting; this time with the officials of the South African Football League, in Lusaka, Zambia.

The American stand on South Africa and Israel was, as we have seen, impossible to reconcile with the United States history and tradition that cherished freedom and democratic principles. It was, therefore, rather embarrassing for the staff of the United States consulate in Johannesburg when, in October, 1988, three South African black anti-apartheid activists took refuge there. Should they hand them back to the authorities for brutal persecution that was certain, or should they let them stay? However, the men decided to leave on their own, the Government having assured them that they would not be arrested again. The three had been held without trial, as many blacks in South Africa are, for about a year when they fled to the consulate from hospital where they had been receiving medical attention. They said that one of the reasons why they decided to leave was that they had received a message from Nelson Mandela on 17 October, 1988, presumably advising them to leave the American consulate. The police were not in sight as the men walked out of the consulate, but it remained to be seen if the Government would keep their promise.

A few days later, anti-apartheid groups in South Africa called for a day of nation-wide protest against municipal elections which were scheduled for 26 October, 1988. It is an offence in South Africa for anyone to call for protests or boycotts of any kind. However, the Government took no action against Archbishop Desmond Tutu and UDF leaders for calling on the people to boycott the elections.

And President Botha and the KwaZulu Homeland Chief, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, clashed over South Africa's so-called liberalization policies to involve blacks in power-sharing negotiations. Botha criticized Buthelezi's attitude, and the latter retorted by calling Botha a "racist" who would not use him as his servant. The clash was most unusual but consistent with Buthelezi's declaration that he would not participate in the power-sharing exercise unless Mandela was released, which placed South Africa in a quandary since the exercise without Buthelezi would most certainly be a farce.

On 19 October, 1988, white South African academics met the

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

ANC in Lusaka. The academics included Principal of the University of Natal, Professor Pieter de Booyesen, and his Vice, Professor Colin Webb. They were out to discuss with the ANC the general state of education in South Africa. The academics, the fourth delegation from South Africa to meet the ANC in ten days, intended to visit universities in Zambia and Zimbabwe before returning home.

In Britain, Opposition Leader, Neil Kinnock, speaking in Cardiff, said that the recent meeting between the ANC and officials of the South African Rugby Union was a step in the right direction. He added that any contact between South Africa's whites and the ANC symbolized a crack in the South African edifice. Every effort should be made to desegregate South Africa "right across the board."

As planned, municipal elections were held in South Africa on 26 October, 1988. The appeal by the ANC and local leaders of the black community to the people of South Africa to boycott the elections was reported largely heeded, as only a small percentage of blacks cast their votes. But the Government was pleased, nevertheless, with the result on the basis of which it planned to embark on the power-sharing exercise with blacks. The white Right Wing made considerable gains at the expense of the Government. They won about three quarters of all the votes cast in rural Transvaal, but the Government retained the cities, including Pretoria and Johannesburg.

The power-sharing idea was a gimmick, somewhat similar to the Israeli plan to conduct elections in the occupied territories, leading to some form of autonomy for the people there, introduced by the Government of South Africa in order to blur the vision of the black majority. What both the Palestinian Arabs and black peoples of South Africa want is nothing short of full, unfettered independence and nationhood in their own land.

Soon after the municipal elections in South Africa, the Right Wing conservatives in the white community were reported to have taken steps to restore racial practices in areas of the Transvaal that they won during the elections. The United States Government was reported to have condemned the move, but it remained to be seen

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

what the Americans would do should the Boers refuse to rescind their decision.

George Bush was elected the forty-first president of the United States on 8 November, 1988, having beaten Democratic candidate, Michael Dukakis, in the presidential election. The news was greeted with jubilation and relief in South Africa because Bush had pledged to pursue the same policies towards the Boer republic as did his predecessor, Ronald Reagan. But, most of Africa and most of the Third World wanted Dukakis to win.

About a week later, the Palestine Liberation Organization leaders, meeting in Algiers, on 15 November, 1988, proclaimed the state of Palestine in exile, but with Jerusalem as its capital. The Israelis described the move as a "smoke screen for terrorism." The Israeli army moved into the West Bank and Gaza Strip, in case there was trouble.

The world was indeed witnessing dramatic changes in politics, economics and all that affected human life, not just in the Soviet Union and East Europe, but almost everywhere else. In many parts of the world, the new changes brought confidence and hope for better things in the future. Elsewhere, as often happens certain states as well as individuals looked at the new developments with cynicism and refused to be influenced one way or another. Some individuals, like Bernans Strijdom, a former South African white police officer who in November, 1988, shot six black South Africans dead in Pretoria, embarked on solo crusades that, they believed, were in the interests of their countries and people. It is a phenomenon that often occurs during moments of human tragedy; that certain individuals feel entrusted with a special calling, understood only by themselves as special individuals, to do something to get their countries and people out of difficult or dangerous situations; like Rudolf Hess who on 10 May, 1941, travelled by air to Britain with compromise peace proposals to end the Second World War or the Australian who on 21 August, 1969, set the Al-Aqsa Mosque on fire so that, he explained after his arrest, the Temple of Solomon could be built on its site. Mr Strijdom, whilst on trial for murder, challenged Archbishop Tutu to a duel (symbolizing the struggle between the black and white communities of South Africa) and, defiantly, argued that he did not believe

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

that killing black people constituted murder. He added that, given a chance, he would gladly kill more black people. Strijdom was believed to be a member of a white extremist group that sought a separate state for the white people of South Africa rather than share one with blacks.

During the same month of November, 1988, 19 UDF members went on trial in South Africa for treason, subversion and terrorism, dating back to 1984. Three were acquitted, while four were found guilty. The remaining were to be tried later. Three of the four found guilty were described as men bent on making South Africa ungovernable.

A few days later, the South African Court of Appeal refused to reopen the case involving the Sharpeville Six, condemned to death three years earlier, arguing that there was no fresh evidence to warrant reopening the case. Thereafter, the only hope left for the Sharpeville Six, five men and one woman, was for President Botha exercising clemency.

On 26 November, 1988, the South African Government released two leading black nationalists, Zeph Mothopeng of the Pan African Congress, and Harry Quala of the African National Congress. Both men were reported to be in poor health and were, therefore, released on humanitarian grounds.

Meanwhile a storm erupted at the United Nations over the refusal by the Government of the United States to grant an entry visa to PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, to address the General Assembly. Many countries, both in the East and West, protested against the American decision. UN Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, denounced the American decision as inconsistent with the position of the United States as host country. There was a strong suggestion that, if the United States did not reverse its decision, then arrangements should be made for Mr Arafat to address the General Assembly by satellite or the General Assembly should meet in Geneva where Mr. Arafat would be in a position to address it.

Early at the beginning of December, 1988, the South African authorities released another anti-apartheid activist, Zwelakhe Sisulu, editor of the *New Nation*, and son of leading ANC official, Walter Sisulu, who himself was released from imprisonment in October, 1989, after twenty-five years in jail. Zwelakhe had been held

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

without trial for two years. He was one of the best-known anti-apartheid activists held by the South African authorities.

And serious trouble was brewing in the South African town of Boksburg, east of Johannesburg, where the white ultra right-wing conservatives had re-introduced apartheid practices of racial discrimination following their victory there and several other Transvaal towns in the October, 1988, municipal elections.

During the second week of December, 1988, the Israelis launched a massive air, sea and land attack against Palestinian targets in Lebanon, near Beirut, to destroy what they said was PLO "terrorist camps" there. Their aircraft dropped paratroops in the area, who were immediately surrounded by PLO fighters and their allies and driven into a ravine. They were rescued only after Israel sent in more planes to bomb PLO positions. Nevertheless, Israelis suffered heavy casualties. However, the Israelis denied PLO claims that several of their men had been captured. Simultaneously, unrest in the occupied territories of Palestine persisted as Arabs there continued their protests and strikes.

PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, addressed the United Nations General Assembly in Geneva on 13 December, 1988, following United States refusal to grant him an entry visa. Israel, as expected, refused to attend, but Arafat who, for the first time ever referred to Israel by name, challenged Israel to come forth and discuss peace with him. He reiterated the decision of the PLO National Council in Algiers in November, 1988, to accept United Nations resolution 242, implicitly recognizing Israel.

Mr Arafat's address won wide diplomatic acceptance in Geneva itself and elsewhere. Diplomats who listened to him regarded the address as a very important statement which Israel would be well advised not to ignore. But Israel, typically, rejected the PLO offer of peace which she referred to as "monumental deception" and as "nothing new". Prime Minister Shamir vowed that his country would never negotiate with the PLO. In Washington, President-elect, George Bush, declared that Arafat's statement was vague on vital issues and did not, therefore, meet United States conditions for establishing dialogue with the PLO, namely that the PLO must state categorically that they recognized Israel's right to existence and renounced terrorism. But, one would have thought that this was

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

plain from Mr Arafat's mentioning of Israel by name for the first time ever as well as from his calling for peaceful coexistence between Palestine and Israel, each existing within safe boundaries.

Palestinians, both in Gaza and West Bank, greeted Mr Arafat's statement with jubilation. Exuberant and enthusiastic, the Palestinians ignored the curfew imposed by the Israeli authorities and came out in large numbers to dance and sing in the streets. An over-joyed Palestinian man, reportedly, grabbed a gun from an Israeli settler in Nablus, West Bank, and shot the settler dead as well as an Israeli soldier passing by, before he himself was shot dead by other Israeli soldiers. About a couple of days later, Israeli troops shot and killed four more Palestinians in Nablus.

At about the same time, there were celebrations in South Africa on 16 December, 1988, to commemorate the Great Trek and the Boers' victory over the Zulus. The celebrations were presided over by President Pieter Botha himself. They were boycotted by the Afrikaner extreme right-wing who accused the Government of Mr Botha of being too soft and conciliatory towards blacks. They wanted strict observance of apartheid and all it stood for. The celebrations came at a time when the future of the Boer nation was increasingly being threatened by the unprecedented wave of agitation by the non-white peoples of South Africa for political rights.

President Botha found himself under tremendous pressure from both the white and non-white communities, which must have placed a severe strain on him, as well.

In January, 1989, President Botha suffered a stroke that roused immediate speculation regarding how long he might be able to continue in office. The President who was seventy-three at the time, had held office for ten years. It was felt that it might become necessary to appoint an acting president until such time that Mr Botha was well enough to resume office, or another head of state was nominated.

Pieter Botha had spent much of his time as head of state caught up between the conservative ring wing of Afrikaner politics and the left wing liberals as he battled to introduce minor reforms in the apartheid system which, he believed, would pave the way to his programme of power-sharing with blacks. He also ushered in moves to disentangle South Africa from Angola and Namibia,

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

aimed at ending civil war in the former and bringing independence to the latter during the course of 1989. Often accused by the extreme right wing of Afrikanerdom of giving in to the demands of blacks, he had not done enough to satisfy blacks either. He had tried to maintain a balance between black and white interests, but with hardly any noticeable success, proving that it was not easy to steer a middle course in South Africa's politics, seriously affected by racial antagonism between the two major communities, blacks and whites.

As violence in the occupied territories escalated in the middle of January, 1989, the United States Government condemned Israeli use of plastic bullets against the Arab civilian population. The territories had, since the end of December, 1987, witnessed a serious upsurge in incidents of violence mainly because of Israeli methods of quelling demonstrations and disturbances resulting therefrom, which were usually brutal. The Arabs had vowed not to end the unrest, in which several hundreds of them had been killed, until Israel yielded to their demands for a homeland of their own.

There were certain features of Arab nationalism that the United States of America could not countenance. These were what the Americans often referred to as "Arab radicalism", represented mainly by the Palestine Liberation Organization and Libyan militant Arab nationalism. Because of this element of radicalism in the PLO and Libyan militancy, the Americans were reluctant or even averse to any contacts with either the PLO or Libya. Relations between the PLO and Libya, on the one hand and the United States, on the other, tended to be confrontational particularly vis-a-vis the policies of either camp towards the Middle East, where the United States played the role of Israel's principal backer, the role viewed by both the PLO and Libya as inimical to the interests of the Arab World as a whole. Both the PLO and Libya have for a long time been regarded by the United States as uncompromising advocates of violent confrontation between themselves and Israel as well as any state at all that supports the Jewish state. However, of the two, Libyan nationalism has proved particularly distasteful to the United States mainly because of what the Americans believe is Libya's commitment to the promotion of international terrorism. Libyan

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

nationalism is, therefore, according to the Americans, something the world would be happy to rid itself of, and they see themselves as the best qualified nation to keep Libyan nationalism in check and thus rid the world of terrorism. Accordingly, the Americans attacked Libya in 1986. The then President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, warned that the United States would, in future, not hesitate to repeat what they had done, should that become necessary. The American attack on Libya took place at a time the Amandla uprising in South Africa was at its peak. There was no doubt then that the non-white peoples of South Africa had the enemy on the run. Were the Americans, perhaps, trying to divert world attention from South Africa by attacking Libya?

In January, 1989, the United States felt concerned at reports that the Libyan air force had acquired in-flight re-fuelling facilities by which air force planes were capable of flying to within striking distance of Israel. According to reports then, Libya had modified several of its transport planes into mid-air re-fuelling tankers, with the assistance of a West German firm.

Libya, justifiably, feared an imminent attack from the United States on a recently constructed factory to manufacture pharmaceuticals. The United States believed that the factory could be modified to manufacture chemical weapons. A controversy had arisen between the United States and West Germany, believed by the former to have assisted Libya in the construction of the factory. The US believed that West German companies were involved in the venture, which was immediately dismissed by the Germans as a fabrication. However, sufficient evidence was later uncovered to link West German with the factory in Libya. But, was this American involvement in Libyan affairs a ruse aimed at diverting world attention from developments in the Middle East, particularly the Intifada uprising, to something else? Earlier, on 3 January, 1989, United States war planes from the aircraft carrier J.F. Kennedy had shot down two Libyan reconnaissance planes in international airspace, over the Mediterranean Sea. The Americans explained that they had felt threatened by the Libyan planes which their pilots, according to the Americans, had manoeuvred into positions of attack, prompting the Americans to open fire in self-defence.

Prior to this incident, tension had been building up slowly over

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

US claims that Libya had been putting up a factory to manufacture chemical weapons, which Libya had repeatedly denied. In the wake of this, Arab nations warned the United States that any attack by them on Libya, as appeared likely, would have the most serious consequences. Several European ally nations of the United States denounced American action against Libyan planes. The recently embarked-on PLO/US dialogue exercise appeared placed in jeopardy, but the PLO had promised to co-operate with the United States in their search for the perpetrators of the Pan-Am air disaster in Britain a few days earlier.

In South Africa, a black community of about nine thousand people at the end of December, 1988, won a law suit against a Government plan to have them incorporated in Bophuthatswana Homeland where they feared persecution for their opposition to the homeland and loss of South African citizenship, if they were incorporated. This was seen as a major victory against the apartheid laws.

Against the expectations of many, Kenya decided to re-establish diplomatic relations with Israel, becoming the sixth African state to do that and the first in East Africa. The news was broadcast by the BBC on 27 December, 1988. The PLO and many Arab nations deplored the Kenyan move, coming as it did at a time when there were signs of a breakthrough towards peace in the Middle East, as a result of the PLO diplomatic offensive which had led to a major shift in the United States policy towards the PLO which Washington had now agreed to talk to directly. The move was rather puzzling in view of the fact that Kenya had not even recognized, as many other leading African nations had done, the state of Palestine proclaimed by the PLO at the end of 1988.

Meanwhile, President-elect, George Bush, said that he believed that a visit by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak to the United States would boost the chances of a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. But President Mubarak thought otherwise. He believed that such a visit would yield nothing so long as Israel remained obdurate regarding the fundamental change in the PLO's policy towards her, evidenced by the PLO's recognition of the Jewish state and the renunciation of the use of violence by the organization, Israel conceding nothing.

On 24 December, 1988, Palestinians staged a one-day strike in

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Bethlehem in the West Bank, in protest against Israeli brutalities that had led to more than three hundred Palestinians being killed since the Intifada uprising started at the end of 1987. And both PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat and leader of the Syrian-based faction of the PLO, Abu Nidal, dissociated themselves from the air crash in Britain, which they also condemned as savage and barbaric. There was speculation then that the plane had been sabotaged Israel, in an endeavour to stop as many Palestinians as possible from rallying to the call of the newly proclaimed state of Palestine and to cause rifts within the ranks of the PLO as well as within the Arab community, like South Africa regarding the non-white community, on 22 December, 1988, appealed to Palestinians who were not members of the PLO to join her in negotiations to bring about peace between the two communities. Earlier, the PLO had expressed fears that either other Palestinian organizations opposed to Mr Arafat, such as those led by Abu Nidal or George Habbash, or the Israeli intelligence organization, MOSSAD, would work to wreck the goodwill prevailing between themselves and the United States Government, as reflected in the dialogue that was going on between the two.

Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, towards the end of December, 1988, won a vote of confidence in the Israeli Parliament (the Knesset) by 84 votes to 19 to, once again, lead the Likud/Labour coalition which pledged itself to counteract the PLO offensive in support of the newly proclaimed state of Palestine. The new Israeli Government would also endeavour to get the United States Government to repudiate its commitment to direct talks with the PLO which, the Israelis stressed, was a "terrorist organization", committed irrevocably to the destruction of Israel.

As the year 1988 drew to a close, three Palestinians were on 28 December, shot dead by Israeli security forces, reportedly, as the three tried to cross into Israel from Southern Lebanon. An exchange of fire ensued between the three and Israeli security forces in which all the Palestinians were killed. The Israelis claimed to have suffered no casualties in the incident, but this was refuted by the PLO who insisted that their men had inflicted several casualties before losing the three men.

Botswana, once again on 28 December, 1988, protested to the

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

South African Government over a bomb blast in a house, which killed one person. The blast occurred despite a recent agreement between the two governments for consultation regarding security matters affecting them.

Meanwhile, factional fighting continued in South Africa between the followers of KwaZulu Homeland Chief Buthelezi and members of the UDF, as the South African Government banned four more anti-apartheid organizations, bringing the number of such banned organizations to well over thirty.

The end of 1988 saw no letup in the violence that had engulfed the occupied territories of Palestine for more than a year. Unrest continued as Israeli soldiers shot and killed more Palestinians in the West Bank. And, as Palestinians in both West Bank and Gaza Strip celebrated the anniversary of the founding of Al Fatah, Israelis sent in troop reinforcements to forestall trouble. Thirteen more Palestinians were deported to Lebanon by the Israeli authorities, bringing the number of deported Palestinians since the Israeli crackdown began in November, 1987, to one hundred. The deportations have provoked world-wide condemnation as both inhuman and against international law.

And about two thousand policemen in South Africa descended on Soweto to intimidate and terrorize the residents, many of whom were questioned, frisked or thoroughly searched.

On 8 January, 1989, PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, was reported by the *Sunday Times of Zambia* as saying that he had information regarding the bombing of the Pan-Am jet liner that led to the Lockerbie disaster in which some 270 people perished. Mr Arafat was reported to have passed this information on to the people probing the disaster.

In the United Nations Security Council on 12 January, 1989, Britain and France joined the United States in vetoing a resolution tabled to condemn United States shooting down of two Libyan planes over the Mediterranean a few days earlier. Last time the three acted together was in 1986, when they vetoed a resolution to condemn United States attack on Libya. And Israeli war planes attacked Palestinian camps in Southern Lebanon. The camps were believed to belong to the Fatah faction of the PLO, led by Abu Nidal.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

The organization of African Unity had, for many years, been busy lobbying sporting associations in Europe and America, seeking their support in Africa's campaign to isolate South Africa. In the United Kingdom, the OAU worked hand in hand with several anti-apartheid organizations to achieve their goal. Thus in January, 1989, the International Cricket Conference laid it down that any cricketer from member states of the association, who played or coached in South Africa, would be banned for five years.

On 25 January, 1989, I was listening to a programme on the BBC, entitled "How It All Began". For discussion that day was how South Africa had evolved and worked out its obnoxious doctrine of apartheid. The BBC narrator conveniently (or could it be through ignorance?) left out the part played by Britain in the creation of South Africa, as it is today. There is no denying the fact that South Africa, as it is today, is largely the outcome of British policies in Southern Africa; policies deliberately pursued to bring about a state for white people in South Africa. Nothing occurred by chance. Nothing happened in South Africa before and after the Boers introduced apartheid and its concomitant racial practices that the British did not foresee at the time they handed over the running of the country to the Boers. South Africa was for a long time a respectable dominion of the British Empire, despite the blood of hundreds of thousands of black people that easily flowed at the white man's pleasure. This blood flowed as the British watched with folded arms — and they still watch as more and more African blood flows in the name of Western civilization and "Christianity".

South Africa was until 1961 a member of the Commonwealth of which Britain was the leading nation. Britain, there can be no doubt, was in a position to stop the Boers from introducing apartheid in 1948. She chose to give a helping hand to the Boers, both politically and, especially, economically, thus placing the non-white races of South Africa, especially blacks, at the mercy of the Afrikaners who took their revenge for the many years of humiliation, persecution and defeat in wars, all of which they suffered at the hands of the British, on the black people of South Africa. For the British, this provided the very much needed opportunity to make money. It still does. Hence Mrs Thatcher's opposition to calls by the international community that economic sanctions be

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

applied against South Africa. For such sanctions would, of course, be applied against British economic interests.

A BBC news broadcast on 26 January, 1989, reported Israeli troops demolishing houses belonging to Arabs in the West Bank, suspected of throwing bombs on the troops. The practice of demolishing Palestinian houses by the Israelis has been condemned all over the world as a serious violation of human rights. The practice was also deplored by the United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, who believed that time had come when the Israelis should meet the Arabs to work for permanent peace in the Middle East.

There was a striking parallel between the Israeli demolishing of Arab houses and the South African bulldozing of black homes in areas declared "white" as well as the complete disregard for human rights in both cases. Noteworthy is also the air of defiance of whatever the rest of the world may say against these actions. Both the Israelis and South Africans derive their strength and audacity to carry out practices as highhanded as these from the conviction that the Western World, particularly the United States, is with them.

There is a strong belief in the Jews that they can do all manner of things to other people because they are a special people. Whoever is the victim of this racial feeling of superiority has no right whatsoever to seek retaliation. Likewise, Jewish views about the horrors of the Second World War or about the evils of racism as reflected in Nazism, should always prevail. Nobody knows better, for no race has ever suffered as much as they did at the hands of Nazi Germany, or will ever do. Thus in January, 1989, the Dutch Parliament approved a government proposal to release two Nazi war criminals who had been held for a long time amid a storm of protest from mainly Jews. Likewise, there was such a furore in the world Jewish community when the people of Austria elected former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, president of Austria. The Jews were displeased because of what they believed was Waldheim's part in the deportation of thousands of Jews from the Balkans during the Second World War. But the Israelis can deport Palestinians from their land; they can shoot and kill Palestinians in cold blood, and no one has any right to protest.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

As unrest continued unabated in the occupied territories, an Israeli court, at the beginning of February, 1989, sentenced several Palestinian youths, some of them only fifteen years old, to two years' imprisonment for throwing stones, the stiffest penalty imposed so far for stone throwing. Twenty more Palestinians were shot and seriously injured. In many other cases, Israeli soldiers broke the hands of Palestinian youths they caught throwing stones so that, thus incapacitated, the youths would not be able to throw stones in future.

P.W. Botha, President of the Republic of South Africa, on 2 February, 1989, resigned his post as leader of the ruling National Party which had been in power since 1948. He, however, held on to the presidency and state headship. He was succeeded by his minister of Education, F. W. de Klerk, who narrowly beat his opponent to the post, suggesting bitter rivalry within the ranks of Afrikanerdom, something unheard of for many years. Almost sheepish racial and national unity as well as fanatical unity of purpose characterized Afrikaner politics of racial survival ever since the days of the Great Trek, some one hundred and fifty years earlier. Events of the past few years, there could be no doubt, had shaken that Afrikaner unity to the extent that the National Party was no longer the unassailable citadel or fortress it had been since D.F. Malan led it to victory in the whites-only general election in 1948. Indeed, uncertainty hung over the future of Afrikanerdom. Many political observers felt that it was in the interest of the Afrikaners to accept, without equivocation, that they were part and parcel of Africa, as their very many statements on this score would suggest. They were, indeed, Africa's only white tribe, who should make every effort to find their position within the family of African nations, congenial with their enterprising and industrious nature. Isolationism or stubbornly pursued religious beliefs that they are God's only specially chosen people, certainly, will not pay dividends, as current events in Southern Africa go to demonstrate. For instance, on 13 November, 1989, the Moderator of the South African Dutch Reformed Church, until recently the pillar of Afrikanerdom and the only church in the country that preached that apartheid was God-ordained, who led a delegation of fellow churchmen to Lusaka, Zambia, for a meeting with President Kaunda, told the

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

President at State House: "... the Dutch Reformed Church has changed the policy of supporting apartheid." With that went the religious or biblical justification of apartheid, rendering the belief that the Boers are a God's specially chosen people bogus and giving credence to the almost universal conviction that apartheid is wrong and totally without justification. The same, of course, is true of Zionism in the Middle East.

Southern Africa could be the scene of dramatic developments, similar to those taking place in Eastern Europe, if Namibia is anything to go by. Side-effects of Perestroika?

The same day that Mr Botha resigned his leadership of the National Party, a Voice of America news broadcast reported the United Nations High Commission for Refugees chief representative in the Middle East having complained that Israel often interfered with his work. The Israelis often harassed or beat up his staff, many of whom worked in hospitals where Palestinian refugees were treated. And about a couple of days later, two Palestinian youths aged fifteen and sixteen years were shot dead at a school near a refugee camp in the Gaza Strip. About twenty-five other people were injured, including a Swiss official of the International Red Cross, who was injured in the legs by a plastic bullet.

On 5 February, 1989, eight Commonwealth Foreign Ministers met in Harare, Zimbabwe, to consider South Africa's manoeuvres of destabilization against neighbouring black states and the imposition of sanctions against the Boer republic, as more Palestinians were shot dead or injured during the ongoing unrest in the occupied territories.

It is clear to every observer that Israel has no intention of accommodating the Palestinians the way they want and is determined, therefore, to put every obstacle conceivable to thwart the PLO diplomatic offensive for a peaceful settlement of the problems in the Middle East. Therefore, Israeli opposition to the PLO/US dialogue in Tunis did not surprise anyone.

On 6 February, 1989, Israel said that the PLO had broken the conditions under which the United States Government agreed to establish direct contacts with the organisation. The Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, told visiting United States Jews that five

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

PLO guerillas shot dead in Southern Israel a few earlier, had weapons to launch attacks in Northern Israel, thereby breaking the conditions by which they (the PLO) had agreed to desist from terrorism.

Not many people would be impressed by this, for Israeli attitude towards the PLO hunt for peace was anything but accommodating. Mr Arens's statement to fellow Jews revealed nothing but the already known Israeli cynicism.

Later, on 7 February, 1989, Israel urged the Government of the United States to break off dialogue with the PLO because the five PLO guerillas killed had been planning a terrorist attack in the north of the country, which was a clear indication that the PLO had gone back on their word to abandon terrorism. But the PLO replied that the five had been on a legitimate military mission, since the PLO did not abandon legitimate military operations against Israel by the undertaking with the United States, which, in no way, signalled the end of hostilities with Israel. The PLO had made it quite clear that hostilities with Israel would continue as long as the latter continued to occupy Arab land in Palestine.

To strengthen their argument, the Israelis pointed out that some of the five dead Palestinians were members of the same PLO wing led by Mr Arafat, that had previously committed acts of terrorism. There could, therefore, be no doubt that the PLO was still committed to terrorism as before, thereby rendering the agreement with the United States null and void.

This was palpable cynicism. The Israelis had rejected out of hand the PLO/US arrangement. No one, therefore, expected them to say anything or act in its support. Besides, were the Americans not mature enough to judge for themselves whether the PLO had indeed gone back on their word in that regard?

However, almost immediately after, the United States Government condemned Israeli methods of controlling Arab unrest in the occupied territories. The Americans condemned what they said was the widespread and undue use of firearms by Israeli soldiers on unarmed civilians. The soldiers were inclined to open fire even in situations where they were not in mortal danger, which, the previous year (1989) alone resulted in about 400 Palestinians being shot dead and more than 20 000 injured, a situation that was tantamount

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

to a serious abuse of human rights or one that thoroughly dehumanized the Palestinian person. In South Africa, such senseless slughtering of people is part of what the Boers call *Kragdadigheid*, which means taking very firm action to quell trouble so that there is no repetition in future.

As expected, the Israelis rejected the American condemnation. They denied that their soldiers used firearms excessively. They argued that their soldiers were often exposed to danger, the type of which the Americans did not understand.

Like the Boers, the Israelis contended that they were misunderstood. Moreover, they alone understood the situation in the Middle East. They alone knew how to handle and understood what was best for those Palestinians, just as the Boers alone knew what was best for the non-white peoples of South Africa.

Those Americans and others were too far away to appreciate what was going on in the Middle East or in South Africa. Besides, they had no right to meddle in Israeli or South African internal affairs.

However, there were indications that it had begun to dawn on the Israelis that the Bush Administration might not be as accommodating to them as the Reagan Administration was, as, indeed, was implied in the US condemnation just discussed, coming as it did soon after the Israelis had urged the United States to repudiate the arrangements by which the Americans had established dialogue with the PLO, something the Israelis frowned upon. But the United States Government did mention to the PLO that it viewed with concern the incident a few days earlier, in which five PLO guerrillas were killed in a military operation in Southern Israel. The United States ambassador to Tunisia expressed his Government's misgivings over the incident when he met a senior PLO representative in Tunis on 8 February, 1989.

Later, the United States warned the PLO that further cross-border incursions into Israel from Southern Lebanon, would jeopardize the dialogue between them. But the PLO argued that Israeli troops in Southern Lebanon, the so-called Security Zone (*cordon sanitaire*), were a force of occupation and, therefore, a legitimate military target. Moreover, Israelis often launched attacks on Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon from the same area. They added that Mr. Arafat could not be held responsible for everything

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

individual Palestinians or Arabs did.

Earlier, before the US warning to the PLO towards the end of February, 1989, Palestinian resisters in Nablus had killed an Israeli soldier by dropping a concrete block on his head from a tall building. The Israelis responded by imposing a curfew on the city. A little while later, they shot and killed a Palestinian youth in Gaza, bringing to more than 350 the number of Palestinians killed since trouble first flared up at the end of 1987.

In South Africa, more than 300 black detainees went on a hunger strike at the beginning of February, 1989, in protest against their detention without trial.

South Africa's record of human rights violations particularly through the practice of detention or imprisonment without trial, is one of the worst in the world and will probably remain so for a long time, if apartheid is not done away with. The new leader of the National Party, Mr. de Klerk, said in Parliament shortly after taking office, that white domination must be done away with and political rights must be given to South Africans of all races. It might be necessary to draw up a new constitution to incorporate these ideas. But he rejected the principle of "One Man, One Vote", saying that it would be disastrous for South Africa. He did not give any reasons why he thought so. Nevertheless, he believed that there must be justice and security for all races.

One would think that Mr. de Klerk was not playing about with words, as nearly all his predecessors had done. The non-white community of South Africa were in no mood for semantics.

Prior to the US condemnation of Israeli methods of quelling unrest in the occupied territories, Arab nations at the United Nations had called for a Security Council debate on Israeli methods of handling the Palestinian uprising in the occupied territories. The Arabs wanted the world body to take steps to stop what they called "Israeli onslaught". It was doubtful whether the United States would allow world condemnation of Israel, the way proposed by the Arabs. However, the PLO United Nations representative called on the Council to take action to stop Israel from terrorizing the Palestinians by firing on civilians with plastic bullets, deporting them or destroying their homes.

And the Vatican in February, 1989, condemned apartheid as the

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

most marked and systematic form of racialism. In a document released for Pope John Paul the Second, the Vatican called for change in South Africa because that was both urgent and necessary, as the African majority were excluded from nearly everything enjoyed by citizens of any country. Africans, in fact, were citizens only in name.

On 11 February, 1989, the South African Government banned all protests organized on behalf of people detained without trial, many of whom had gone on hunger strike; some, for as long as three weeks, demanding that they be taken to courts to stand trial or be released altogether. On 13 February, 1989, leading South African anti-apartheid personality, Alan Boesak, went on a hunger strike in sympathy with about 300 black detainees in South African jails. In a letter to South Africa's Minister of Law and Order, Adriaan Vlok, Boesak pointed out that he could not stand idle by watching the 300 or so people die of hunger. Later, Archbishop Desmond Tutu urged members of the Anglican community to fast for three days to show their solidarity with the detainees, some of whom had become so weak that they had been taken to hospital where they were receiving medical attention. Following a meeting between Archbishop Tutu and Mr. Vlok, there was hope that some, if not all, of the detainees might be released soon. During the meeting with Archbishop Tutu, Mr. Vlok had indicated that the detainees might be released, if they called off their hunger strike. He asked the Archbishop to persuade them to do so, which the Archbishop undertook to do.

In South Africa, during the month of February, 1989, there occurred something that certainly would be greeted by the Boers as most welcome. It was a tragic and sad episode in the struggle by the black people of South Africa against racial oppression, that should never have happened. One would hope that the black people of South Africa learnt from the incident both to be very careful how they conducted themselves and to be more vigilant in future in the face of the ever watchful enemy who is always ready to exploit incidents such as that one, to his advantage. For the incident amounted to playing into the hands of the enemy.

It so happened that on 16 February, 1989, anti-apartheid organizations denounced Winnie Mandela, wife of the imprisoned Afri-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

can Nationalist leader, Nelson Mandela, and accused her of being involved in the activities of a band of black youths in Soweto, called the Mandela Football Team. The youths had been acting as Winnie's bodyguard and had been held responsible for the abduction and assault on four other youths in Soweto, one of whom, Stompie Moeketsi, had died. The organizations thought that Winnie had abused the trust and confidence they had in her and, therefore, would not have anything to do with her. But Winnie vigorously denied any wrongdoing. Credit went to the black community of Soweto, especially Stompie's parents and relatives, who restrained themselves and did not allow the situation to get out of hand, which could have led to serious divisions in the black community of Soweto and in the struggle against the forces of apartheid.

On 18 February, 1989, representatives of the ANC in Lusaka, Zambia, issued a statement appealing to anti-apartheid organizations in South Africa not to shun Winnie Mandela. The statement pointed out that Winnie's shortcomings should be viewed against the background of her contribution to the freedom struggle. But Nelson Mandela himself, from prison, intervened, ordering his wife to disband the Nelson Mandela Football Team. Soon afterwards, South African Police raided the home of Winnie Mandela and arrested four men. They said that they found blood stains in the house and torture instruments as well as blood-spattered clothing, which they would examine. Winnie denied there were any such items in the house.

In Palestine, an Arab youth, on 17 February, 1989, was shot dead in Nablus and about six other Palestinians were injured in Gaza during disturbances as Soviet Foreign Minister, Edward Shevardnadze, began a tour of the Middle East, part of a Soviet global plan to end regional conflicts. Mr. Shervadnadze was to visit Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Iraq and Iran. The Soviet Union felt that they had a major role to play in the Middle East peace process towards which the PLO had taken positive steps. This was Moscow's most substantial diplomatic effort in the region for many years. The Soviets had made a major contribution towards global peace by coming to terms with the United States on a number of issues of world significance, which had provided a basis for resolving regional conflicts.

The Amāndla and Intifada Uprisings

Unlike Kenya which had re-established diplomatic relations with Israel in recent times, Ghana, on 17 February, 1989, elevated the status of the PLO diplomatic mission in Accra to that of an embassy. PLO chairman, Yasser Arafat, was in Accra for the occasion.

And in South Africa, the Government banned for three months two anti-apartheid newspapers in Cape Town. The papers affected were *Grassroots* and *New Era*. They were banned for allegedly publishing anti-Government revolutionary material, which was: stirring hatred towards security forces and promoting the esteem of banned organizations or persons.

On 18 February, 1989, Mr. Shevardnadze conferred with President Assad of Syria, the country that Moscow regarded as the key to any peaceful settlement in the Middle East because of its close links with the USSR. But Syria was also the odd man out among the Middle East Arab states because of its opposition to the Camp David settlement between Israel and Egypt. However, Syria, like the Soviet Union, supported the idea of an international conference on the Palestinian issue — the conference was a brain-child of the Soviet Union. Syria also supported a PLO faction opposed to Mr. Arafat's leadership. The Soviet Union appeared to be the best qualified nation to persuade Syria to play a role that would facilitate a rapprochement between the two PLO factions.

PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, said on 19 February, 1989, that there had been indirect talks on a truce between his organization and the Israelis in Southern Lebanon. The Israelis, however, denied this and said that the PLO had in the past tried, on several occasions, to establish contacts with them, but that these contacts were always rejected.

Soviet Foreign Minister, Edward Shevardnadze, after consultations with Arab leaders in Syria and Jordan was to meet with Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, in Egypt, to discuss the possibility of an international conference on the Middle East, which was seen as a major breakthrough by the Soviet Union since the Israeli Government had always been averse to such a conference. And, meeting with King Hussein of Jordan, Mr. Shevardnadze said that a time for an international conference on the Middle East should be set. He believed that such a conference should be held some time in 1990. But the Israelis were still opposed to the idea,

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

particularly should such a conference mean that they should meet the PLO.

Mr. Shevardnadze went to Cairo after meeting with King Hussein, according to a Voice of America news broadcast on 20 February, 1989. He met with President Hosni Mubarak and declared that there was no difference between their positions on the Middle East. He also believed that the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council should organize the international peace conference on the Middle East, to involve the PLO.

Meanwhile the Israelis shot and injured several Arabs in the occupied territories in the continuing clashes. In the West Bank, the Israelis demolished a house belonging to an Arab family and sealed two others.

Mr. Shevardnadze met Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, in Cairo on 22 February, 1989, to discuss Soviet Mid East Peace Plan. The two men described their talks as constructive. The talks were to resume a few days later at ministerial level. Whilst in Cairo, the Soviet Foreign Minister also met PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat. He strongly criticized Israel for its opposition to the international peace conference on the Middle East. He pointed out that Israel did not want to live in peace with her neighbours, as was reflected by her refusal to talk to the Palestinians. Mr. Shevardnadze also proposed that a high-ranking United Nations official be posted to the Middle East to monitor the peace process in the region. Israel remained the only nation in the region opposed to the Soviet-proposed international peace conference.

President Hosni Mubarak said, after meeting with Mr. Shevardnadze, that if Israel accepted the idea of the international peace conference on the Middle East, there would be peace throughout the region because that would bring some hope to the minds of many Palestinians who would then stop their current agitation. And Chairman Yasser Arafat expressed his willingness to talk to any Israeli leader who was willing to listen to him about the desirability of peace in the area. Mr. Arafat added that Israel was the only stumbling block to peace in the Middle East by refusing to talk to the PLO. He criticised Israel for trying to choose leaders for the PLO. He stressed that unlike the Israelis, the PLO was always ready to negotiate peace terms with the Israelis. He said this at

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

a press conference he held for Israeli journalists in Cairo.

The Israeli obduracy reflected in their refusal to meet the PLO was very similar to South Africa's refusal to meet African nationalist opposition groups such as the ANC and the PAC.

In South Africa, blacks in the town of Cartonville decided to boycott white-owned businesses in response to the reintroduction of racial segregation by the white authorities there, as had been the case in another South African town, Boksburg, two months earlier.

Seven blacks were on 27 February, 1989, reported killed in factional fighting in Natal, some of them, children. It was believed by many people that South African police encouraged some of this factional fighting which, by the end of 1989, had claimed more than 1 600 lives, nearly all of them black. It was, of course, to the advantage of the South African authorities that blacks should be fighting each other and dissipate their energies that way, instead of fighting the real enemy, the apartheid system.

A few days earlier, the black community of Soweto had maintained commendable calm and dignity as they buried Stompie Moeketsi, the murdered 14-year old youth whose death had led to the isolation of Winnie Mandela. Her bodyguard, the so called Nelson Mandela Football Team, were suspected of having been behind Stompie's death. Two members of the team had been arrested and charged with the murder of the youth.

On 5 March, 1989, a Palestinian held by the Israelis died in prison. This triggered off more rioting by the Arabs both in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In both places, Arab stone throwers were fired on by Israeli soldiers. In Gaza, the stone throwers retreated into a United Nations clinic as they came under fire from the Israeli soldiers. Whereupon, the Israelis, using bulldozers, broke into the clinic.

In South Africa, the decision by President Botha to retain the presidency after he had handed the leadership of the National Party over to Mr. F.W. de Klerk, had caused a split within the ranks of Afrikanerdom, with many Afrikaner politicians demanding that Mr. Botha should hand over to Mr. de Klerk the presidency as well. However, Mr Botha wanted to carry on until the end of his term of office in March, 1990.

The *Times of Zambia* on 10 March, 1989, reported PLO Chair-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

man, Yasser Arafat, having called upon the United States to distinguish between resistance and terrorism. The PLO had condemned acts of terrorism which they would no longer support or condone, but they would fight in self-defence, if attacked, and that could not be termed "terrorism".

An Israeli soldier was on 18 March, 1989, killed in an ambush near the Jordanian border. The attackers fled across the border into Jordan. Israel said that it would hold Jordan responsible, although Jordan had always been careful not to allow any attacks on Israel to be launched from its territory. This was the first time that any attack on Israeli soldiers had been planned in that area and the first time that attackers on Israelis had got away unscathed. Widespread violence was also reported in the Gaza Strip where Israeli troops had warned that more Palestinian houses would be demolished, if attacks on the troops did not cease. Three Palestinians were shot dead in the violence. This did not help matters, and the violence continued unabated for another day. On 19 March, 1989, another Palestinian was shot dead by the Israelis after, reportedly, he had stabbed and injured three Israeli soldiers.

The two Arab attackers who on 18 March, 1989, killed an Israeli soldier in an ambush, were identified as members of the Syrian-based Al Fatah which was opposed to the leadership of Yasser Arafat. The men were believed to have been arrested by Jordanian security forces, after they had crossed into Jordan. Meanwhile, pressure was mounting on Israel to talk to the PLO in statements made by several eminent political leaders in Europe and the United States.

On 20 March, 1989, a detachment of Israeli troops moved northwards from the Israeli-held Southern Lebanon to attack pro-Iranian guerrilla positions well inside Lebanon, where they clashed with Shi'ite militiamen. Israeli planes were later brought in to attack positions belonging to the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine in the Bekaa Valley. Meanwhile, violence in the occupied territories continued without any letup. Four more Palestinians were shot dead, two of them youths aged 12 and 18 years. The United States Government urged Israel to find a way to end the unrest.

On 25 March, 1989, British Prime Minister, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, offered British assistance in arranging an international

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

peace conference to solve South Africa's problems. She made the offer on the eve of her departure to tour four African countries: Morocco, Nigeria, Zimbabwe and Malawi. She said that before Britain could get involved or before she herself could visit South Africa, the Government there would have to release jailed nationalist leader, Nelson Mandela, so that he could freely participate in whatever peace process there might be, provided, she added, he renounced violence.

Israeli soldiers on 13 March, 1989, shot and killed six Palestinians in the West Bank. Many more Palestinians were injured. The mayor of Bethlehem described the killings as "a massacre". The officer commanding Israeli forces in the area explained that Israeli border police had entered the village of Nahalin because they believed that people who had earlier attacked motor traffic on nearby roads, had come from the village. On entering the village, they came under heavy attack when rocks and boulders were hurled at them. They, therefore, felt compelled to open fire in self-defence. But the villagers gave a different version. They said that very early in the morning that day, after prayers, they found police in the village, who indiscriminately opened fire on them.

The incident heightened tension in the occupied territories, with the Israeli authorities bringing in troop reinforcements in several places, in case there was more trouble.

The International Red Cross on 14 April, 1989, condemned the killings of Palestinians in the West Bank on 13 March, 1989. In a statement from Geneva, the society said that Israeli security forces shot civilians without discrimination and without restraint. The society deplored the excessive use of fire-arms and physical violence against unarmed civilians or *terrorism* (my own italics). It added that Israeli action in the West Bank "violated fundamental human law". The British Government too condemned the killings. They said they were dismayed and appalled.

To guard against a repetition of demonstrations by Palestinians a few days earlier, the Israelis amassed troops around the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem. Curfews were also imposed in many parts of Gaza Strip.

The first anniversary of the death of Abu Jihad, 16 April, 1989, was observed by Palestinians as "a day of rage". The day also wit-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

nessed three Palestinians shot dead by Israeli security forces. The three included a ten-year old boy who was killed near the town of Hebron in the West Bank.

On the same day, South African-backed soldiers in Namibia killed two more SWAPO guerrillas in Northern Namibia, as the force sent in by the United Nations continued to monitor the guerrillas' return to Southern Angola where, under the terms of the agreement worked out between Cuba, Angola and South Africa, they had been confined.

PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, on 18 April, 1989, criticized Arab nations for failing to honour their promise to the people of Palestine in their fight against Israeli tyranny. He said that the sums of money pledged by the Arab nations had not been forthcoming in sufficient amounts to sustain the Intifada in the occupied territories.

In Southern Africa, eleven SWAPO guerrillas had been killed by the South African-backed Namibian troops in the north of the country since the United Nations-sponsored ceasefire came into force on 8 April, 1989. People in the area had sent a petition to the United Nations Chief Representative in Namibia, Marti Ahtisaari of Finland, signed by 6 000 people, asking him to take steps to confine South African troops to their bases, as provided for by the Namibian Peace agreement.

A court in South Africa on 28 April, 1989, sentenced three ANC black activists to death for the murders of two black policemen and a local politician in 1986. The three, Jabu Masina, 36, Tingting Masango, 28, and Neo Potsane, refused to defend themselves and demanded prisoner of war treatment. When sentence was pronounced, the men, all in combat uniform decorated with ANC colours, stood and shouted, "Long live the ANC."

On 1 May, 1989, a leading white anti-apartheid activist, David Webster, a senior lecturer at the university of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg was shot dead by gunmen from a passing car. Anti-apartheid movements were outraged and described the shooting as an assassination.

As the PLO sought membership of the United Nations agency, World Health Organization, at the beginning of May, 1989, the United States Secretary of State, James Baker, threatened that if the PLO were admitted to WHO, the United States would with-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

draw, taking with them their 74 million dollars contribution to WHO's budget of 300 million dollars. However, indications were that the PLO, who were accorded observer status at the time, would not be admitted. In South Africa, a military base close to the Botswana border, near Mafeking in Northern Cape Province, was hit by mortar bombs on 3 May, 1989. An army vehicle, trying to pursue the attackers, believed to be ANC guerrillas, was blown up after hitting a landmine nearby. South African military sources said that there were no casualties in either incident. On the same day, an Arab youth in Jerusalem stabbed two people to death as he ran along a street shouting: "Allah akbar", - God is great. He was saved from being lynched by a mob by police who quickly took him away.

According to a BBC news broadcast on 5 May, 1989, Iran's parliamentary speaker, Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, had urged Palestinians to take reprisals against Westerners for Israeli killings of Palestinians. He was reported as saying that Palestinians should kill Westerners, destroy factories in Europe or America and hijack planes. This would inhibit Israelis against treating Palestinians the way they had been treating them. This statement surprised many in the West where Rafsanjani was regarded as a moderate among Iran's leaders. Nevertheless the Western World denounced Rafsanjani's speech, and the PLO said that they had no intention of attacking people who were not directly connected with Israeli atrocities against Palestinians.

One of South Africa's leading ministers, Chris Heunis, announced on 12 May, 1989, that he was leaving politics. Responsible for constitutional affairs, Heunis was regarded as the brains behind the "reforms" in the apartheid system introduced over the past few years. And the new leader of South Africa's National Party F.W. de Klerk, announced that drastic changes in the apartheid system would be introduced. But this in no way meant that South Africa was ready for the "One Man, One Vote" wanted by the majority blacks. On the contrary, everything would be done to ensure there was no majority rule. de Klerk later in September, 1989, succeeded P.W. Botha as president of South Africa.

On 14 May, 1989, the Israeli Parliament approved a plan worked out by the Prime Minister, Mr Shamir, to arrange for elections in the occupied territories, as a first step towards a settlement. Is-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

rael was to seek international support for the plan. But Palestinians had rejected it unless it guaranteed Israeli total withdrawal from the territories, which would pave the way to independence and full nationhood for the Palestinians, as opposed to autonomy entertained by the Israelis.

Mr Shamir arrived in London on 21 May, 1989, for talks with Mrs Thatcher. He was seeking British support for his plan to arrange for elections in the occupied territories, leading to autonomy for a limited period of time. Meanwhile, turmoil continued in both West Bank and Gaza Strip, and many more Palestinians were killed or injured.

Egypt was re-admitted to the Arab League on 23 May, 1989, and attended the League's summit held that day in Casablanca, Morocco. She was expelled in 1979 after she had signed the Camp David Accord with Israel. The summit was also attended by Libya, bitterly opposed to Egypt because of the Camp David Accord.

In South Africa, a white member of an extremist racial organization was on 25 May, 1989, found guilty of murdering eight Africans in Pretoria in November, 1988. The man said that he was proud of what he did and would happily do it again. And an Israeli court acquitted four Israeli soldiers of a charge of manslaughter. The soldiers were charged with killing a Palestinian Arab in 1988 in the Gaza Strip, whom, assisted by several other soldiers, they beat and kicked to death.

The following day, 26 May, 1989, 14 blacks were sentenced to death in a South African court for killing a black policeman in 1985. Only one of the 14 was found guilty of actually killing the policeman and three for assaulting him. However, they were all found guilty because of acting for a common purpose. The lawyers for the 14, 13 men and one woman, said they would appeal against the sentence.

A voice of American news broadcast on 5 June, 1989, reported Zaire Foreign Minister, Nguza Karl 1 Bond, having met South Africa's President Botha in South Africa. The Zaire minister said after the meeting that to end or ease racial tension in the Boer republic, it was advisable that leaders of the two racial groups, should meet to discuss common problems.

He added that boycotting South Africa the way the Organiza-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

tion of African Unity and many United Nations bodies were doing, had not yielded any tangible results.

Somebody should have told Mr. Karl I Bond that Africans in South Africa had always wanted to meet leaders of the white community and talk things over, but their efforts had always been spurned by the whites who would not meet elected and recognized leaders of the black community even at the time Mr. Karl I Bond was talking to Mr. Botha.

Twelve blacks were on 6 June, 1989, sentenced to death in South Africa's black homeland of Ciskei for the killing of five youths in 1987. The twelve were found guilty on the basis of common purpose. And President Botha extended for one year the state of emergency imposed in 1986. The state of emergency was due to expire at the beginning of the second week of June, 1989.

The Israeli authorities on 11 June, 1989, lifted the curfew imposed on the Gaza Strip and in force for the previous one week, but the curfew remained in force in the largest refugee camp where Israeli soldiers shot and killed an eight-year-old Palestinian boy on 10 June, 1989. Meanwhile an official of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry, Dr. Boutros Ghali, was in Israel for talks on the Palestinian situation, the highest Egyptian official to travel to Israel for the purpose.

President Kaunda addressed a press conference at State House on 13 June, 1989, on his recently concluded tour of the West Indies and the United States, during which he discussed with leaders he met, who included President Bush of the United States, a number of topics centred on matters of common interest, in particular what happened in Southern Africa after Namibia. The President said that he hoped that South Africa would honour its pledge to the Namibian independence to which it often said it was committed. He mentioned that during the tour, it had been suggested to him that he should meet the new South African leader of the National Party, which, he said, he would consider in view of President Botha's imminent retirement. The President hoped that the new South African leader, F.W. de Klerk, meant serious business when he said that he intended to end apartheid in South Africa. He pointed out that for Zambia, ending apartheid meant the acceptance of the principle of "One Man, One Vote", leading to

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

genuine democracy, and nothing else. There was no compromise on that. It had also been suggested that the Eminent Persons Group (EPG) should be revived after the next Commonwealth summit in Malaysia, with the intention of paving the way to a general conference on South Africa, to be attended by Frontline States and representatives of the Commonwealth. The Conference was to be preceded by the fulfilment of the following conditions by South Africa: the lifting of the state of emergency; release of Nelson Mandela and all other political detainees; the unbanning of the African nationalist political organizations, ANC and PAC; return of all South African exiles and the creation of an atmosphere conducive to meaningful and fruitful dialogue between the South African Government and opposition parties.

But the South African Government on the same day, according to a Voice of America news broadcast, issued new restriction orders on two leading black anti-apartheid activists, Archie Gumede of the UDF and Govan Mbeki of the ANC.

On 23 June, 1989, Israeli troops declared the Gaza Strip a closed military zone following the abduction of an American citizen by men believed to be Arabs. The PLO condemned the abduction. The American was an employee of the Save the Children Federation and was the first foreigner to be seized since the Intifada began. The kidnappers demanded the release of all Palestinian prisoners.

At the end of June, 1989, thousands of Jews in the occupied West Bank staged protest marches, demanding more protection from Palestinian attacks, although, by and large, they were armed whilst Palestinians were not. Jewish settlers both in the West Bank and Gaza Strip often shot and killed Palestinians with the firearms they possessed, with absolute impunity. It is amazing that such people should seek protection from the Palestinians who were most of the time at their mercy.

Leaders of Israel's Labour Party were meeting on 6 July, 1989, to consider withdrawing from the coalition government with the Likud Party of Mr. Shamir. The reason for this was the new hard-line conditions introduced by the Government in the plan to conduct elections in the occupied territories, to which the Palestinians were opposed. The Government now said that the elections

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

could not be held while the Palestinian uprising continued. A spokesman for the PLO said that the new conditions closed the door to peace. The plan for the elections had been agreed by both Likud and Labour, as partners in the coalition Government.

South Africa's President, P.W. Botha, on 14 August, 1989, resigned the state presidency saying that his ministers no longer listened to him and after a bitter row with the National Party Leader, F.W. de Klerk, over the latter's proposed trip to Zambia for a meeting with President Kenneth Kaunda, which Mr. Botha strongly disapproved of. Mr. Botha left office one month earlier than was expected, and Mr. de Klerk was later on 15 August, 1989, sworn in as acting president until elections were held in September.

On the same day as Mr. de Klerk was sworn in as acting President of South Africa, several British and Australian rugby players arrived in South Africa to participate in activities marking one hundred years of rugby in South Africa amid protests from Africa and the rest of the Third World.

The rugby players, in the name of sport which they believed had nothing to do with politics, were supporting a regime with the blood of hundreds of thousands of black people in South Africa on its hands, victims of racial oppression and of apartheid.

Jews or Israelis today still hunt for World War II criminals responsible for the persecution or deaths of Jews during the war, with the assistance of the Western World which includes South Africa. When Africans protest against sporting links with South Africa, they are often labelled "extremists" or "agitators". But Jews are given all support in their hunt for war criminals, because, perhaps, Jews are white and have money and are, therefore, able to buy influence. As far as Africa is concerned, the perpetrators of Sharpeville or Soweto and many other atrocities against the black people of South Africa are no less criminal than those the Israelis or Jews look for.

In August, 1989, PLO representatives and United States diplomats differed on the Israeli plan in the occupied territories. The United States Government supported the plan for elections while the PLO did not think that the elections would advance the cause of peace in the area.

The Israeli elections plan sounded similar to South Africa's plan

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

to hold talks with "moderate" representatives of the black community.

On 18 August, 1989, South African police in Johannesburg arrested a leading anti-apartheid activist. He was one of the men who took refuge in the American embassy in 1988 and left only after receiving assurances from the authorities that he and his colleagues would not be re-arrested. The man was an official of the United Democratic Front (UDF).

After all, Mr. de Klerk had begun to bite despite his seemingly sweet tongue.

The Organization of African Unity ad hoc committee on Southern Africa meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe, on 21 August, 1989, issued what was described as tough conditions for future talks between the South African Government and black nationalist organizations:

1. Unbanning of the nationalist political organizations;
2. Releasing of all political prisoners and detainees;
3. Ending of the state of emergency;
4. Removing of all troops from African townships; and
5. Ending of all political trials and executions.

On 23 August, 1989, an apartheid defiance demonstration at Gugulethu near Cape Town, led by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, was dispersed by police using teargas. Several such demonstrations had been organised in the Cape Town area, but they had all been broken up by police.

South Africa's Acting President, F.W. de Klerk, in August, 1989, stepped up his efforts to meet African heads of state. He was due to meet President Mobutu of Zaire on 25 August and President Kaunda of Zambia on 28 August. He had already met President Chissano of Mozambique.

South African black nationalists regarded these meetings as personal initiatives of the presidents concerned and, therefore, dissociated themselves from the meetings which, basically, were beside the point, as far as the nationalists were concerned. Some African heads of state saw no point in the meetings, as long as South Africa refused to meet the representatives of the black majority. Notable among these was President Robert Gabriel Mugabe of Zimbabwe.

There seemed to be something sinister in the proposed visit to

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

Zaire by Mr. de Klerk. Zaire had never been serious about African liberation and, probably, never will be under present leadership. What purpose could Mr. de Klerk's visit serve, one might ask? In all probability that of throwing spanners into the works of African liberation. Marshal Mobutu, it was an undeniable fact, was a very close friend of South Africa's backers, the West. He could not, therefore, be expected to make a positive Pan-African contribution towards solving South Africa's problems, in particular ending apartheid, which was believed to be on the agenda of the talks he was to have with Mr. de Klerk. President Mobutu would also discuss with Mr. de Klerk the initiative taken by several African heads of state, including himself, in June, 1989, at Gbadolite in Zaire, to end the civil war in Angola.

The Israeli authorities on 24 August, 1989, expelled four more Palestinians from the West Bank. And on 27 August, 1989, Israeli planes attacked Shi'ite Hizbollah positions in Southern Lebanon. Earlier in July, Israelis had kidnapped a local leader of the Hizbollah, Sheikh Obeid.

President Kaunda met South African Acting President, F.W. de Klerk in Livingstone, Zambia, on 28 August, 1989, as planned. It was expected that the two men would discuss, among other things, the ANC's conditions for a future settlement, but according to Mr. de Klerk, that did not take place. Nevertheless the two men were heading for a clash over the Angolan peace plan as agreed a few days earlier by the OAU and hoc committee on Southern Africa, which suggested that the UNITA rebel leader, Jonas Savimbi, should go into the Angolan army. However, it was agreed that the matter should be discussed with President Mobutu of Zaire, who had hosted the Gbadolite talks.

On 30 August, 1989, South African police began arresting volunteers in the apartheid laws defiance campaign launched earlier in the month. They arrested Mrs Leah Tutu, wife of Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and many other women who had demonstrated against apartheid in Cape Town and demanded an end to the detentions of children as well as the release of those already held. Later, South African Law and Order Minister, Adriaan Vlok, accused Arch-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

bishop Tutu of scandalous behaviour by turning the cathedral in Cape Town into a political meeting place. But the archbishop challenged the Government to arrest him if what he had done was against the law. He pointed out that the Government had made it impossible for his people to meet anywhere other than in the cathedral.

White South Africa went to the polls on 6 September, 1989, and police had been given powers to stop and search anyone, especially blacks, as a security measure against any move to disrupt the elections, from which blacks were excluded. Earlier on 1 September, 1989, anti-apartheid groups had organized protest demonstrations against the elections and against new labour laws which unionists described as anti trade unionism. Later, police arrested Archbishop Tutu and other church leaders.

Three more Palestinians were shot dead on 2 September, 1989, in the West Bank town of Nablus. Several others were injured. In Gaza, Israeli troops opened fire on a number of Arab youths who were throwing stones, fatally wounding one man. By that date, according to the BBC, 627 Palestinians had been killed in clashes with Israeli troops since the Intifada began. 41 Israelis had also died.

In South Africa, police dispersed a large crowd of demonstrators in Cape Town, protesting against the September 6 general election. Police used teargas, whips and water cannon. Many demonstrators were arrested, including the Reverend Alan Boesak who urged the demonstrators to "defy, defy and defy".

On 3 September, 1989, Israel reported one of its soldiers having been shot dead by a lone gunman who had crossed into North-East West Bank from Jordan. Israeli troops returned the fire and killed the attacker who was in civilian clothes and armed with a rifle and revolver. Jordan denied that its border had ever been violated that way.

And anti-elections campaigners in South Africa, on 3 September, 1989, planned to march on the beaches reserved for whites only.

Israeli planes, on 4 September, 1989, carried out raids on what the Israelis called "terrorist bases" in Southern Lebanon for the second time in less than two weeks.

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

There had been widespread condemnation of the methods used by South African police in breaking up election-protest demonstrations in several parts of the country. For instance, they banned a church service that was to take place at a Methodist church in Cape Town. Heavily armed police surrounded the church and stopped everybody from entering. They later detained the Reverend Alan Boesak who had gone to the church to see what was happening. Elsewhere, police used dogs, whips, teargas and water cannon to break up very orderly demonstrations, inflicting serious injuries and arresting hundreds of the demonstrators. This took place on 4 September, 1989.

Simultaneously in Palestine, Israeli troops shot and wounded scores of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip as Palestinians in both places stepped up their agitation against the Israeli occupationist forces. Like the Boers in South Africa, the Israelis used whips on young demonstrators, inflicting serious body injuries.

On 5 September, 1989, thousands of blacks in South Africa stayed away from work in protest against the elections of 6 September, 1989. The National Party of South Africa was as expected, returned to power, but with a significantly reduced majority, in an election that was accompanied by widespread protest by the black majority who did not take part as they, constitutionally, were not allowed to. Anti-apartheid leaders said that altogether South African security forces killed 23 people, all of them black, around Cape Town, including a 69-year-old woman whose body was found riddled with bullets. Alan Boesak described this as a massacre.

On 7 September, 1989, Israel reported rockets having been fired onto its territory from the Jordanian side of the border on the night of 6 September, 1989. The rockets caused no damage, but Israel held Jordan responsible, even though the policy of that country was against such incidents being carried out on its territory.

The following day, 8 September, 1989, Palestinians staged strikes to mark twenty-one months since the start of the current unrest in which more than 600 of their people had been killed, most of them by Israeli security forces. More and more Israelis were becoming of the opinion that the Palestine problem needed a politi-

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

cal rather than a military solution.

An Israeli soldier was, on 10 September, 1989, killed in a shoot-out in an area of Southern Lebanon, between the Syrian Golan Heights and Lebanon, on the Lebanese side of the border. An Arab guerrilla or "gunman" (BBC language) was also killed. It was believed that the attackers were members of the Hizbollah, one of whose leaders, Sheikh Obeid, had been kidnapped by the Israelis in July, 1989.

A young man, aged 19 years, was also shot dead by Israeli soldiers in the West Bank city of Nablus. According to the Israelis, he was about to throw a bomb. And a Palestinian deputy mayor of a town in West Bank, regarded as a collaborator with the Israeli authorities, was killed by Arab nationalists. The man had been appointed by the Israeli occupationist authorities and had several times been advised to resign, but refused.

The Israeli army Chief of Staff, on 12 September, 1989, ordered soldiers to stop using excessive force when dealing with Palestinian participants in the Intifada. That followed reports of Israeli soldiers brutally beating up, wounding and maiming Palestinian resisters in the occupied territories, as a result of which some soldiers had been prosecuted.

In South Africa, anti-apartheid groups, continuing their defiance campaign begun in August, on 30 September, 1989, demonstrated at a segregated beach, reserved for whites only near Cape Town. They were led by Archbishop Tutu and the Reverend Alan Boesak. At one stage, police ordered them to leave in ten minutes or they would open fire on them. But the group, numbering about a thousand, ignored the order, and police were forced to back down. The demonstrators then began to swim and to picnic. A group of white extremists hurled insults at the jogging Tutu — Christian society members! The defiers rounded off the day with prayers and then left.

And Israeli troops shot to death two Palestinian youths in Nablus for, reportedly, throwing stones at them, as Israel prepared to celebrate its new year. The shooting down of Palestinian youths for "throwing stones" had almost become a daily occurrence in the occupied territories of Palestine.

On 3 October, 1989, a deputation of the ANC discussed the

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

mechanics of dismantling apartheid with US spokesman on African affairs, Cohen. The meeting took place in the United States. Leading the ANC deputation was Thabo Mbeki, son of leading ANC veteran nationalist, Govan Mbeki. A few days earlier, the ANC had discussions with a group of prominent Afrikaners in London. And President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt discussed his country's plan for a settlement in the Middle East with President George Bush of the United States in Washington. Mr. Mubarak warned that then was the opportunity for a peaceful settlement, which should not be missed.

A court in Israel on 3 October, 1989, sentenced a man to six months' imprisonment for talking to PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, in 1988. The man had been a peace campaigner for a long time. He was accused of having broken a law enacted in 1986 forbidding all contacts between Israeli citizens and the PLO. He met Mr Arafat in Tunis and Paris in 1988. The man challenged the authorities by declaring that he would continue to disobey the law after his release from prison.

And Israel rejected Egypt's ten-point peace proposals. The Egyptian Government had suggested a meeting between representatives of the Israeli Government and those of the Palestinians, to take place in Cairo.

Another African State, Ethiopia, on 3 November, 1989, re-established diplomatic relations with Israel. A statement by the Ethiopian Government said that the conditions under which relations were severed in 1973 no longer existed. For example, the Sinai peninsula had been restored to Egypt, and Egypt had been readmitted to the Arab League. Relations between Ethiopia and Israel reached the lowest level in 1985 when several hundreds of black Jews, the Falashas, were taken to Israel. The move to restore relations between the two states was seen in some quarters as a way by the Ethiopian Government to deny Ethiopian rebels in the north of the country, Israeli arms.

Israeli soldiers on 9 November, 1989, shot dead a Palestinian man in Nablus, who they said belonged to an extremist group known as "Red Eagle", which was responsible for most of the trouble during the uprising. They arrested ten other men.

In a weekend of unprecedented violence, Israeli soldiers on 3

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

December, 1989, shot and killed a ten-year old Palestinian girl in the Gaza Strip. Earlier, they had shot and killed four Palestinian men in the West Bank town of Nablus, whose premises they had entered after, reportedly, disguising themselves as Arabs.

On 9 December, 1989 the second anniversary of the outbreak of the Intifada uprising, the Israeli authorities placed both the West Bank and Gaza Strip under curfew and drafted thousands of heavily armed soldiers and police into the areas, to ward off any possible outbreaks of violence. Nevertheless, many Palestinians were shot dead or wounded in clashes with Israeli security forces in both the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The 10th December, 1989, as the Palestinian Intifada entered its third year, was a particularly violent day. The Israeli security forces shot and killed several Palestinians in the cities of Hebron and Nablus in the West Bank as well as in Gaza city. Many more Palestinians were injured.

On the same day, President Mubarak of Egypt criticized Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, over a statement made by the latter suggesting that an independent Palestinian state might be established in or could be carved out of Jordan. Mr. Mubarak slammed the suggestion as retrogressive. By the same token, he said, the Arabs could go back to claiming not just the West Bank and Gaza Strip, but all the lands where the state of Israel stood, for the Palestinians.

Critics of the PLO leader, Yasser Arafat, had always pointed out that PLO recognition of the right of the state of Israel to existence was premature in view of the fact that the Jewish state conceded nothing substantial to the Arabs to warrant such recognition. Instead, Israel continued with her obdurate policies. However, the supporters of the PLO initiative believed that to win concessions from Israel, one had to go via dialogue with the United States and the Western World as well as win international support and sympathy, as the PLO led by Mr. Arafat were doing. For Israel would remain obdurate for as long as she was assured of United States support. Conversely, she would soften up when there was a realization that that support would not be readily forthcoming.

But the initiative taken by the PLO was not something to be left to the organization alone. It was something that called for well-coordinated concerted efforts by the entire Arab world and a deep

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

sense of national unity as well as unwavering national commitment throughout the Arab world. In this connection, what is happening in Lebanon would appear disastrous if allowed to continue uncorrected. For there is no doubt that Israel benefits by the Lebanese constitutional impasse, to which she would like to see all Arab attention diverted. A way must be found quickly to settle the Lebanese crisis to the satisfaction of all so that sufficient Arab energies and resources may be set aside to deal with the Israeli menace. Latest developments suggesting a rapprochement between, on the one hand, Egypt, and Syria and Libya, on the other, are a very encouraging sign indeed and should be supported by all Arabs. Unity is strength — South Africa's national motto. To achieve unity calls for a large measure of self-denial and sacrifice both at national and individual levels. The entire Arab world should be in a state of intifada, as it were; for the enemy is, indeed, formidable. There should be no illusions about this. However, Angola and Namibia have shown that the enemy is not invincible. He can be beaten, but a greater effort than just the Intifada in the occupied territories of Palestine must be made by all Arab nations. For Israeli arrogance is an affront not just to the Palestinians, but to the entire Arab race, just as apartheid is an affront to all black peoples wherever they may be. The Organization of African Unity has no illusions about this and, accordingly, over the years, it has spared no effort in tackling this peril. Results have not been lacking. Mozambique and Angola rid themselves of Portuguese exploitative and oppressive rule in 1975, after long and bloody wars the effects of which still linger on. Zimbabwe achieved what had been regarded by many as an impossible task, namely beating the army of the Rhodesian white settlers and winning national independence in 1980. In Namibia, SWAPO are well on the road to victory, thanks to the long, hard, bloody but relentless struggle that they put up against the seemingly unbeatable forces of occupation and racial arrogance.

And during his Christmas pilgrimage to the Holy Land in December, 1989, speaking in Jerusalem, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, criticized Israeli treatment of Palestinians both in Israel and in the occupied territories, which he likened to the treatment of black people in South Africa by the whites. Archbishop Tutu also called

The Amandla and Intifada Uprisings

for a separate state for the Palestinians. Later, the Israeli Minister for Religious Affairs, the only Israeli minister who spoke to the Archbishop during all the five days he was in the area, had a meeting with the South African churchman, at which the two men discussed the Archbishop's speech. After the meeting, the Israeli minister said that the Archbishop did not understand the problems of the Middle East. The Minister was particularly displeased by the comparison Tutu had made between Israeli and South African treatment of people under their domination.

Of course, Israel, like South Africa, is always "misunderstood". However, the situation in Israel or the Middle East, like the situation in South Africa, is such that not many people would fail to understand what has been going on between the Jews and Arabs there, and Archbishop Tutu, with all the vast knowledge of people and world affairs derived from a good, sound education, is hardly the man to fail to see that Israel is, indeed, like South Africa. Nor is he the first man to have noticed that.

The Israelis were, on 26 December, 1989, reported to have sent their troops across their border with Lebanon, as they have done many times in the past, to attack Palestinians in the Bekaa Valley. Did they take the cue from the American presence in Panama? Was it mere coincidence? But Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Shamir, congratulated the US on "restoring democracy to Panama".

A BBC news broadcast on 3 January, 1990, reported Amnesty International, once again, having condemned Israeli use of firearms against Palestinian demonstrators during the current unrest in the occupied territories, which has resulted in many Palestinian deaths. Amnesty International said that there were indications that Israeli soldiers were encouraged by the authorities to use firearms even in situations that did not endanger life, such as confrontations between the soldiers and Palestinian demonstrators armed with stones only.

Israeli authorities dismissed the allegations by Amnesty International as baseless.

Five

THE COUNTDOWN

As the year 1987 came to an end, it was quite clear that South Africa's presence in Namibia and its military intrusion into Angola, would sooner or later prove untenable.

Many observers believe that it all began with the fight for the strategic town of Cuito Cuanavale in South-East Angola, involving Angolan and Cuban forces, on the one hand, and UNITA rebel forces assisted by South African forces, on the other. South African forces received such a thrashing that they were temporarily thrown into disarray and compelled to withdraw close to the Namibian border in order to avoid heavier casualties than they had suffered. They never posed a serious threat again.

It should be noted that South Africa's involvement in the Angolan civil war in 1975, had always been a very sensitive and highly contentious issue in the white community who saw no strong reason for that involvement and bitterly resented the idea that their sons should fight and die in far away Angola in defence of those UNITA blacks they knew nothing about and who, as far as the whites of South Africa were concerned, were no better than the other blacks their sons were called upon to fight against. It was abhorrent that white people should die in defence of blacks they knew little or nothing about and for a cause that no one had demonstrated to be worth dying for, as far as the white people of South Africa were concerned. This, together with the mauling they received at the hands of the combined force of Angolan and Cuban troops, the divisions within the ranks of Afrikanerdom that had

The Countdown

done much to weaken the hitherto unchallengeable National Party and the weakening of Boer national cohesion that resulted from it as well as the ever-increasing world-wide condemnation of the apartheid system, forced the South Africans to beat a very quick retreat. From then on, there was little doubt about the outcome of Pretoria's military involvement in Angola that started in 1975 with South Africa providing military assistance in form of arms and ammunition to the Western-backed Angolan rebels in a bid to rid Southern Africa of what was believed in Pretoria to be definite Soviet infiltration into the region and to impress the West, particularly the United States, of South Africa's determination to rid not only the Southern African sub-region, but the entire continent of Africa of the Communist threat. However, as time went on, South African forces found themselves playing a major active role and, eventually, got entangled in the Angolan conflict out of which they, at the end of 1987, darted faster than they had gone in, beaten, disgraced and empty-handed. They had no other option but to sue for peace in order to avert a possible cross-border hot pursuit by a combination of Angolan, Cuban and SWAPO forces right into Namibia itself.

Who could tell where it would all end? Suffice it to say that it was a piece of drama that caused many a sleepless night for the Boer leadership in Pretoria. The events that followed the South African military debacle in Southern Angola, including the Namibian peace process, have been surpassed, in their dramatic and momentous nature, perhaps, only by the events now taking place in Eastern Europe.

The Middle East has not been quiet either.

After many years of suffering persecution and racial oppression, the Palestinian people in both the West Bank and Gaza Strip on 9 December, 1987, launched the Intifada uprising that took the Israeli authorities by surprise. It was a people's uprising in the sense that it involved all Palestinians: men, women, young and old as well as children, and not just armed guerrillas. The Israelis had not witnessed anything like that before.

The Intifada was followed in November, 1988, by the proclamation of the state of Palestine by the PLO leadership who also launched a vigorous diplomatic offensive to win both internation-

The Countdown

al recognition for the new state and support for their cause, with commendable success. Soon after, cracks began to show in the Israeli political apparatus, which have begun to grow wider the longer the Intifada lasts and the more states recognize Palestine. Clearly, the initiative is with the Arabs, as it is with the black peoples of Southern Africa regarding the political situation there. The Israelis, in a vain attempt to turn the clock back, can only become more brutal and obstructionist, as evidenced by their recent acts of repression in the occupied territories and tendencies to obstruct peace initiatives in the region, such as their persistent refusal to talk to the PLO and their attempts to choose who should speak for the Palestinian people. The Israelis should be told that this gimmick was tried by the imperialist nations of Europe, who refused to talk to popularly elected leaders of their people, such as Ho Chi Minh in Indo-China (Vietnam), Mahatma Gandhi in India, Kwame Nkrumah in the Gold Coast (Ghana), Ahmed Ben Bella in Algeria, Patrice Lumumba in the Congo (Zaire), Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya, Kenneth Kaunda in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), Eduardo Mondlane in Mozambique, Joshua Nkomo in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) etc., etc. But, in the end, the imperialists bowed to the inevitable and met all these men or their colleagues; and the game was up. The writing is on the wall for the Israelis to read. It is the PLO, and nobody else that they will have to talk to, if there is to be peace in the Middle East. Current indications are that the Boers in South Africa are about to abandon their traditional but totally unprofitable intransigence and foolhardiness any one of these days and talk to the recognized leaders of the black community, if their releases from prison of leading black nationalists, the meeting on 13 December, 1989, between Mr. F.W. de Klerk and Nelson Mandela and the relaxed political atmosphere these developments have led to, are anything to go by. However, the anti-apartheid groups are not satisfied with these. Rejecting Mr. de Klerk's reform programme and pledging to continue with the fight against apartheid, they would like Mr. de Klerk to take concrete steps towards ending apartheid and the creation of a truly democratic society. This was repeated at a conference held on 9 December, 1989, in Johannesburg and attended by about 4 500 delegates and representatives of anti-apartheid groups in South Afri-

The Countdown

ca. It was strongly felt that the minor reforms in the apartheid system introduced by Mr. de Klerk might be intended to make apartheid more attractive to world opinion.

However, as already stated, there are signs that the Zionist-Apartheid edifice has begun to crack up. Some of these signs were noticed long before SWAPO's victory at the polls in the November, 1989, pre-independence election.

Other signs are the following.

On 15 December, 1988, the United States Government in a major policy statement made public by Secretary of State, George Shultz, agreed to have direct talks with the PLO aimed at bringing about peace in the Middle East. This followed a press conference clarification by PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, on 14 December, 1988, of the principal points in his statement to the United Nations General Assembly in Geneva on 13 December, 1988, that the PLO unequivocally renounced terrorism and accepted United Nations resolutions 242 and 338 on the Middle East, thereby acknowledging the existence of Israel.

Reacting to this, the Israelis called this day the darkest in Israel. But the United States believed that the PLO had met their conditions for direct talks. This was the most important shift in the United States Middle East policy since Camp David.

The Soviet Union called for immediate preparations for a Middle East international peace conference.

The United States designated their ambassador to Tunisia to establish the necessary contacts with the PLO. And the United Nations General Assembly meeting in Geneva declared that from then on, the PLO should be referred to as 'Palestine'. Nevertheless, the United States Government reaffirmed that they would always stand by Israel, after clarifying that they did not recognise the newly proclaimed state of Palestine. They also warned that further acts of terrorism by the PLO would lead to immediate cancellation by them of all contacts with the PLO. Meanwhile, unrest continued in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In Nablus, Israeli troops shot dead four Palestinians and injured more than twenty others.

In Brazzaville, Congo, the same day that Mr. Arafat addressed the UN General Assembly in Geneva, the protocol to bring peace to Angola and independence to Namibia was signed by represen-

The Countdown

tatives of South Africa, Angola and Cuba, thus signalling the end of colonialism in South-Western Africa. Barring unforeseen obstacles, the Namibian independence process was to commence on 1 April, 1989, with Cuban troops beginning their withdrawal from the south to the north of Angola until all should leave the country in twenty-seven months.

Angola pointed out one problem that had not been discussed during the talks, and that was: who was going to finance the Cuban troop pull-out, which was likely to cost about 800 million United States dollars? Angola believed that this could not be borne by her alone. Nor could Cuba provide very much help. Therefore, other nations should help, as the two states, i.e., Angola and Cuba, would be very hard-pressed to raise that kind of money.

It is an undeniable fact that the United States of America is the mainstay of Zionist Israel, principally because the United States, as a country and nation, is controlled, to a considerable extent, by the Jews who use their massive wealth and colossal sums of money to influence American economics and politics. This is the main reason why Israel has proved such an intractable problem. Indeed, one would not be very far from the truth if one were to state that, to all intents and purposes, Israel is part of the United States of America.

It was not surprising, therefore, when, early in March, 1988, certainly at Israel's instigation, the United States Government moved against the PLO United Nations Observer Mission which they wanted to see closed. They clashed against the UN General Assembly which, almost unanimously, voted against the US government move. Apart from the United States themselves, there was only one dissenting vote; that of Israel. The American Government's move was prompted by a decision taken earlier not to have anything to do with "terrorist organizations". The PLO, according to the US Government, certainly with Israel lurking in the background, was a terrorist organization which should not be allowed to function on American soil.

On 14 March, 1988; South Africa's Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha, and United States Assistant Secretary of state for African Affairs, Chester Crocker, met in Geneva for talks aimed at finding a way to end the Angolan civil war. This was the latest stage in

The Countdown

the recent series of diplomatic activities to find a way to resolve the Angolan impasse, involving a number of countries that had roles to play: Angola itself, South Africa, Cuba, the United States and the Soviet Union. The talks came at a time when there was bitter fighting for the control of the strategic town of Cuito Cuanavale in South-eastern Angola between Angolan forces supported by Cuban troops, on the one hand, and UNITA rebel troops supported by South African forces, on the other. We have seen that the battle of Cuito Cuanavale marked a turning point for South Africa's military involvement in the Angolan civil war.

The talks in Geneva coincided with similar diplomatic manoeuvres aimed at ending a similar situation in Afghanistan, also taking place in Geneva between representatives of the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan as well as the Soviet Union, presided over by UN envoy, Diego Cordovez.

Israeli Premier, Yitzhak Shamir, the same day, i.e., 14 March, 1988, left for Washington for talks with the United States Government regarding Israel's rejection of American peace proposals in the Middle East, particularly the Palestinian question as worked out by US Secretary of State, George Shultz. Mr. Shamir was seen off by a huge crowd of supporters.

On 24 March, 1988, the Frontline heads of state held a summit in Lusaka, Zambia, at which they endorsed Angola's proposals for a peace plan to end its confrontation with the South African-backed UNITA rebels and to bring about the independence of Namibia. They condemned the Reagan administration's stepped up aid for UNITA. Earlier in the month, Angola had proposed a time-table for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from the south to the north of the country, in talks with representatives of US and Cuban governments.

In a communique, the Frontliners reiterated their strong objection to the US linkage of the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

And UNITA proclaimed a government over the area of Angola under their control, which, they said, was about one third of the total Angolan territory. Frontline Chairman, President Kaunda of Zambia, commenting on this development, declared that it would not change anything as far as the Frontliners were concerned.

The Countdown

US Secretary of State, George Shultz, was touring the Middle East at the beginning of April, 1988. In Amman, Jordan, Mr. Shultz conferred with King Hussein regarding US peace proposals to end the Arab-Israeli conflict in the region. The United States had proposed an international conference to settle the PLO issue, but without PLO participation since, as far as the Americans were concerned, it was a terrorist organisation. In other words, the US-proposed conference differed substantially from the all-embracing international peace conference on the Middle East proposed by the Soviet Union.

Countries involved in the Angolan peace process met in London on 3 May, 1988, to discuss how they could end the civil war in the country and bring about independence for Namibia. The countries that met were: Angola, Cuba, the United States and South Africa.

On 13 May, 1988, South African and Angolan ministers met in Brazzaville, Congo Republic, to discuss ways and means of bringing about peace in Angola and independence in Namibia. South Africa had always maintained that Cuban troops in Angola would have to be withdrawn before she could consider granting independence to Namibia. Angola, on the other hand, insisted that the Cubans would not leave so long as South Africa continued to support the UNITA rebels and so long as South African troops continued to occupy Southern Angola. South Africa was represented at the talks by Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha, who was accompanied by Minister of Defence, Magnus Malan, while Angola was represented by Justice Minister, Fernando Van Dunem. Mr. Botha indicated, in a statement, that his country was seeking the Afghanistan kind of settlement — No winner, no loser.

Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States met again on 11 July, 1988, in New York, to resolve the Namibian independence impasse and to discuss the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with a view to seeking how they could be repatriated. The four had that far also met in London, Brazzaville and Cairo. Meanwhile, UNITA leader, Dr Jonas Savimbi, visited Britain, as Angola protested.

Angola, Cuba and South Africa on 2 August, 1988, returned to Geneva for more negotiations regarding the repatriation of some 50 000 Cuban troops in Angola and the independence of Namibia.

The Countdown

Cuba had proposed to pull its troops out of Angola in four years. South Africa wanted them out in seven months, while she herself would start pulling out of Namibia on 1 November, 1988.

On 8 August, 1988, President Quett Masire of Botswana was hurt in a mid-air mishap as he travelled by air to Luanda, Angola, to attend a Frontline states summit convened to discuss the latest developments regarding Namibian independence and the repatriation of Cuban troops based in Angola. The mid-air mishap, in which an engine on the presidential plane exploded after being hit by a ground-to-air missile erroneously fired at the plane which had, apparently deviated from the right course, attracting the attention of Angolan security forces in the area, was almost reminiscent of the plane crash in which President Samora Machel of Mozambique was killed in 1986. However President Masire's plane was able to land in emergency at Cuito Bie in Angola.

Later, on 10 August, 1988, Angola, Cuba and South Africa agreed to a ceasefire at a meeting in Geneva, chaired by the United States. South Africa began to pull out of Angola. Cuba agreed to pull its troops out of Angola and South Africa agreed to grant independence to Namibia, to be preceded by elections, supervised by the United Nations. South African troop withdrawal from Angola was completed on 31 August, 1988.

United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, visited South Africa on 22 September, 1988. He met representatives of the South African Government for talks. He also met representatives of the Namibia interim administration. The main topic for discussion was the implementation of United Nations resolution 435 on Namibian independence.

Radio South Africa commented on what it called the "proposed Southern African conference", to involve South Africa and several neighbouring black states — Zambia and Zaire were specifically mentioned.

The purpose of the conference was, apparently, to survey ways of bringing peace to Southern Africa, an idea given birth to by South Africa. Zambia denied the suggestion that President Kaunda was to have a meeting with South Africa's President Botha. South Africa was, at this time, trying very hard to win friends in Africa as a way to mollify world opinion against apartheid which

The Countdown

had been pushed into a very tight corner indeed. The first target of this initiative was, quite obviously, the Frontline states, and she appeared to have scored a major diplomatic victory when during the same month of September, 1988, President Botha paid a state visit to Mozambique where he had talks with President Joaquim Chissano in what was described as a cordial atmosphere. Important bilateral issues were discussed, such as South Africa's support for the MNR rebels and economic co-operation.

On 1 October, 1988, Mr. Botha went to Zaire where he met President Mobutu for discussions. It was not known what the two men discussed and what prompted the meeting, but observers believed that the meeting may have been prompted by current discussions at the time involving South Africa, Angola and Cuba under the chairmanship of the United States regarding Namibian independence and Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola. South Africa was also keen on the idea of a Southern African summit involving itself and all neighbouring black states to discuss matters of common interest. But the meeting with the Zairean head of state was regarded by many as a bad start, since Zaire had strong links with the Angolan UNITA rebels.

The following day, 2 October, 1988, Mr Botha returned home in a jubilant mood after talks with President Mobutu at Gbadolite, Zaire. Among items discussed were: the situation in Angola and Namibia, overshadowed by talks aimed at bringing an end to the civil war in Angola and independence for Namibia involving South Africa itself, Angola, Cuba, the Soviet Union and the United States. They also discussed possible release of Nelson Mandela and the fate of the Sharpville Six. The last two items were rather surprising in view of South Africa's refusal to discuss them with foreign governments. Mr. Botha, however, stressed that his Government would continue supporting UNITA in Angola until there was a government of national unity there.

President Kaunda on 10 October, 1988, met Marshal Mobutu of Zaire in Lubumbashi, Zaire, for a briefing on Mr. Botha's visit to Zaire a few days earlier, which had been condemned by several African leaders in Southern Africa, notable Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe. Former Tanzanian President, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere also condemned the visit to Zaire by Mr. Botha. Both Mugabe and Nye-

The Countdown

rere believed that talks with Botha were useless and should, therefore, not be encouraged.

Earlier, Zimbabwe's Foreign Minister, Nathan Shamuyarira, had, in New York, slammed Botha's visit to Zaire. He pointed out that it was rather ironic that states that contributed nothing or were opposed to the African liberation Movement, were the ones now posing as champions. Shamuyarira was also chairman of the OAU Liberation Council.

All this came in the wake of what was described by international mass media as an unprecedented diplomatic offensive by Mr. Botha into black Africa, whereby he was able to pay visits to Mozambique, Malawi and Zaire in only a few weeks. But Botha in Malawi or Zaire was hardly any offensive at all, if one were to take into consideration these countries' policies. Speculation was rife following Botha's visit to Zaire that a summit involving several Southern African states and South Africa, was to take place in Lusaka, Zambia, at the beginning of October, 1988. But Zambia, the host country, denied such a summit had been planned at all. A summit of frontline states was, instead, arranged for 12 October, 1988, in Gaborone, Botswana, but was abruptly cancelled, reportedly, at Zimbabwe's insistence. Speculation had it at the time that the Frontliners had some differences over Mr. Botha's so-called offensive, to which President Kaunda, the chairman, appeared to be responding by agreeing to meet President Mobutu soon after the latter had met Botha, which was interpreted in some quarters as talking to Botha through Mobutu.

The ANC issued a statement in Lusaka on 11 October, 1988, appealing to all African states to slam their doors on Botha and condemned in particular Botha's talks, with Mobutu. They described Botha as "the butcher of Soweto". Botha, in Switzerland at the time, countered that the ANC wanted to see Mandela continue languishing in jail.

Meanwhile, both South Africa and Cuba denied that a time-table for Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola had been agreed, believed to be two and half years. Cuba emphasised that the time-table for the withdrawal of its troops would only be agreed when the security of Angola was assured. However, on 15 November, 1988, it was reported that Angola, Cuba and South Africa had reached

The Countdown

agreement on the repatriation of Cuban troops and Namibian independence, after many months of meetings in several parts of the world. But, it was not until 22 November, 1988, that South Africa was reported to have formally accepted the plan to repatriate the 50, 000 Cuban troops and to bring independence to Namibia, as earlier agreed in Geneva between Angola, Cuba and South Africa itself, under the chairmanship of the United States. The way was now open for the signing of a special protocol to give effect to this. Accordingly, South African Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha, accompanied by Defence Minister, Magnus Malan, left for Brazzaville on 2 December, 1988, to sign the protocol to bring peace to Angola and independence to Namibia. While in Brazzaville, the South Africans took time off to visit Marshal Mobutu in nearby Kinshasa. Later they returned to South Africa to consult their Government, saying that difficulties had arisen over the question of verifying Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

Following these developments, UNITA threatened to go it alone and fight for its own independence without the assistance of South Africa which appeared to have abandoned the rebel movement by its involvement in the talks with Angola and Cuba.

The United Nations debating apartheid at the beginning of November, 1988, singled out Japan as South Africa's leading trading partner. In self-defence, the Japanese argued that figures relating to Japan's trade with South Africa, might be misleading because of currency fluctuations. The trend should be downward, and not upward.

Meanwhile, PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, met leading US Jews in Stockholm, Sweden, for talks, arranged with the help of the Swedish Government. Israel condemned the talks and warned that they could damage relations between itself and Sweden.

And a leading PLO official, Abu Shariff, on 9 December, 1988, met a British Government minister for talks. Until then, the British Government had always insisted on PLO recognition of Israel's right to existence and the organization's renunciation of terrorism or violence as conditions for any dialogue between themselves and the PLO. The PLO had met these conditions, on the proviso that they were reciprocated by Israel; otherwise they would be meaningless. But Israel, characteristically, rejected the PLO move out of

The Countdown

hand. In the United States, Israel's principal backer, the PLO move was given a lukewarm response, but was welcomed in Britain and in several other leading nations of Europe, a very significant development indeed. However, as already discussed, the United States Government changed their attitude towards the move made by the PLO to recognize Israel's right to existence and their renunciation of terrorism or violence, when they announced on 15 December, 1988, that they would establish dialogue with the PLO with whom they would talk directly.

A short while later, the Israeli Government denounced the decision by the United States Government to have direct talks with the PLO and described the development as a stab in the back. The Israelis said that they had been let down by an ally who had chosen to talk to Israel's most deadly enemy.

PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, believed that the Israelis were out to sabotage the US-PLO rapprochement when the Israelis killed four Palestinians in Nablus soon after. Nevertheless, talks between PLO representatives and the United States embassy in Tunis were reported to have made good progress. Encouraged, the PLO were to send delegations to the Soviet Union and Western Europe to seek support for an early convening of the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East.

On 27 December, 1988, heads of state of all Frontline nations met in Lusaka, Zambia, to take a look at recent developments in South-Western Africa. Also in attendance was SWAPO President, Sam Nujoma. Chairman of the Frontliners, President Kaunda, made an appeal to the United States President-elect, George Bush, to end American support for UNITA. The Angolan Government had, in the meantime, issued a declaration that they would pardon all subversive elements in the country, who would lay down their arms and stop fighting during the next twelve months. But the representatives of UNITA overseas said that they saw nothing new in the declaration and pledged continued fighting until the Government negotiated with them.

Earlier, on 22 December, 1988, a historic agreement had been signed in New York, at the United Nations, by the foreign ministers of Angola, Cuba and South Africa, paving the way for the independence of Namibia and Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.

The Countdown

Namibia was described as Africa's "last colony". However, many African nationalists in Southern Africa disputed this. To them, Africa's last colony should be South Africa, and not Namibia.

Thus ended 27 months of negotiations, with the United States as mediator, to bring peace to South-Western Africa, although the United States insisted that they would continue to support UNITA in Angola, regarded by the Frontline states as a counter-productive move. Following the signing of the historic agreement in New York just referred to, South Africa promised to cease aiding UNITA rebels in Angola, as provided for by the agreement.

The withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola got under way on 1 January, 1989, as provided for by the agreement just signed. Angolan Defence Minister, Pedro Maria Tonha, took the occasion to point out that between the Angolan and Cuban troops had broken the myth of the invincibility of South Africa. And the ANC announced that they would close their bases in Angola so that South Africa should not use their presence there as an excuse to slow down the South-Western peace process. It was believed that the ANC would move their bases to Tanzania.

On 3 January, 1989, the Americans and the PLO had another round of talks in Tunis. The Americans were reported to have sought PLO assistance for information leading to tracking down the perpetrators of the Pan-Am airliner bombing in Britain on 21 December, 1988. PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, had condemned the bombing of the plane, which he described as barbaric.

Earlier, Israel had rejected calls for moderation in response to PLO initiatives. The latest call was made by British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, who, speaking at the end of a visit to Kuwait, called on Israel to respond with moderation to recent PLO peace initiatives. Reacting to Sir Geoffrey's call, the Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, speaking in Jerusalem, said that Israel could not respond favourably to the PLO offensive because she believed the PLO were essentially a terrorist organization, bent on the destruction of Israel. He lauded appeals by several nations in the West as well-meaning, but added that they did not live as close to the forces of mortal danger as Israel did. The PLO were these forces, and accommodating them would not lead to peace,

The Countdown

but, on the contrary, would lead to more violence and more terrorism.

The PLO chairman, Yasser Arafat, on 13 January, 1989, met a British minister William Waldegrave, in Tunis for talks, a gesture by the British in support of the PLO peace initiatives in the Middle East. Almost simultaneously, British Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe, urged the Israelis to give peace a chance. He added that the Israelis should have the courage to talk to the PLO in search of peace. And Mr. Waldegrave warned that the world was changing and, unless the Israelis changed with the world, they would be left behind. These were some of the strongest words ever uttered by a British Minister on the Middle East situation. Meanwhile, UN-ITA rejected the amnesty announced by the Angolan Government.

On 12 January, 1989, the PLO scored a major diplomatic victory at the United Nations when the Security Council gave the organization a right to address the Council directly as "Palestine", instead of through a member nation as before. This came about as the PLO sought permission to participate in a debate about the shooting down of two Libyan planes over the Mediterranean by US forces on 4 January, 1989.

The *Times of Zambia* of 13 January, 1989, carried an article on church leaders representing some 19 million black Americans having announced a joint effort to bring pressure to bear on Pretoria to end apartheid. They said that they would urge President-elect, George Bush, to join an international boycott of Royal Dutch Shell and would pressure Congress to apply comprehensive economic sanctions on South Africa.

The Reverend Alan Boesak pointed out that South Africa had been pressed to seek peace in South-West Africa and Angola because of United States sanctions which, though they had a limited effect, warned that worse could befall the Boer republic.

The United Nations Security Council on 16 January, 1989, gave a green light to the UN force for Namibia to go ahead, but difficulties arose over the cost of maintaining the troops there. Some UN members suggested that the force be reduced from the original 7,000 to a smaller number. This met opposition from OAU member states who saw in the suggestion a move to water down resolution 435 of the UN on Namibia, by South Africa.

The Countdown

At about the same time, thirty-five states, including the United States and the Soviet Union, met in Geneva to discuss human rights. The United States Secretary of State, in typical fashion, in a speech, pointed out that, in general, there had been a great improvement in the observance of human rights in many parts of the world, but "dark areas remain". He singled out Czechoslovakia and Rumania, as states belonging to these "dark areas" where human rights were still trampled on. Should he not have included Israel and South Africa? Of course not. The Americans had a very narrow view of the violations of human rights, which suggested that human rights were violated only in the Communist World and in other parts of the world run by dictators. However, Mr. Shultz praised Russia, Hungary and Poland for improvements in the observance of human rights.

George Bush was on 20 January, 1989, sworn in as the 41st President of the United States of America. Mr. Bush declared that he would not be rushed into signing treaties with the Soviet Union, as his administration was overshadowed by nuclear arms control negotiations embarked on earlier by his predecessor, Ronald Reagan, and Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. But Mr. Bush pledged his administration to continue with the dialogue with the PLO unless the PLO resumed their support for international terrorism. In the meantime, the US ambassador to Tunisia met representatives of the PLO for informal talks which were described by both sides as useful.

On 26 January, 1989, Minister of Manpower in the South African Government, Piette Duplessis, resigned. Yet another set back to the National Party led by the ailing P.W. Botha and a blow to Afrikaner national cohesion.

President Kaunda on 25 January, 1989, met British Deputy Foreign Minister, Mrs Lynda Chalker at state House in Lusaka. He told Mrs Chalker that no African country had done as much as Zambia in working for a peaceful settlement of the problems of Southern Africa. The President added that Zambia had, on many occasions, tried to talk peace to all the settler rulers of states in Southern Africa: the Portuguese, the Rhodesians and South Africans, but to no avail. Mrs Chalker was reported to have reaffirmed

The Countdown

Britain's commitment to bringing about peaceful change in Southern Africa through dialogue

The President pointed out that he was amazed at the picture painted of him by the right-wing British press as a confrontationist and a man committed to armed struggle as means to end apartheid in South Africa. This was carried by the *Times of Zambia* of 26 January, 1989.

And South African Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha was quoted by the same paper as saying that the peace process in South-Western Africa and Namibian independence could be placed in jeopardy by SWAPO's military build-up close to the Namibian border.

Towards the end of January, 1989, PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, met with three foreign ministers of the European Economic Community in Madrid, Spain, seeking their support for the international conference and the peace process in the Middle East as well as to forge links between the EEC member states and the just proclaimed state of Palestine. Mr. Arafat was meeting the EEC for the first time.

The ANC on 31 January, 1989, met lawyers from South Africa to consider a constitution for a non-racial South Africa. The lawyers came from six English and Afrikaans universities and included well-known white South African anti-apartheid activist, Frederick van Zyl Slabbert. The ANC wanted to find out what role the lawyers could play in ending apartheid. Of particular significance was that the meeting provided an opportunity for representatives of two communities in South Africa, which could not meet in South Africa itself, to exchange views on what they thought their country should be. Meetings of that nature were anathema inside South Africa. There could be no doubt, therefore, that white opinion of a South Africa not totally controlled by white people was undergoing fundamental change, rendering the future of apartheid uncertain.

And President Robert Mugabe on a visit to the United Kingdom said that he believed that South Africa would intensify its destabilization efforts in neighbouring Frontline states after pulling its troops out of Angola and Namibia, because it would have more troops at its disposal.

According to Radio Zambia on 2 February, 1989, the United

The Countdown

Nations Secretary-General had supported the suggestion by some members of the UN that the force for Namibia be reduced from the proposed 7 500 to about half that figure, in order to reduce costs. But the BBC on the same day, reported the UN Chief having expressed concern at the delay in assembling the force, who should start their work in Namibia on 1 April, 1989. Setting-up the force had been held up by the wrangle at the UN, with African diplomats fearing that a reduction in the force would leave South Africa in a strong position that would enable her to interfere with the elections in the territory.

On 20 February, 1989, in the heat of the Salman Rushdie affair, a proposal by the French Foreign Minister that the EEC nations temporarily recall their envoys to Iran was accepted unanimously by the EEC foreign ministers at their meeting in Brussels. This followed Britain's concern over the fate of its citizen, Salman Rushdie, author of a novel, *The Satanic Verses*, regarded by moslems in many parts of the world as blasphemous and for which Rushdie had been condemned to death by the spiritual leader of Iran, Ayatollah Khomeini. The EEC nations were outraged by the Ayatollah's pronouncement and, at Britain's instigation, unanimously agreed to take a common stand which would leave Iran in no doubt of the seriousness and concern with which they all viewed this development.

It must be noted that several of the same EEC nations, Britain in the lead, had often had serious reservations on proposals that economic sanctions be applied against South Africa. They were moved by the fate of one man to the point of risking a serious diplomatic rupture with Iran.

At the end of February, 1989, Mr. William Waldegrave, the first British Minister to meet and hold discussions with Mr. Yasser Arafat, left for Israel. While there, he urged Israelis to accept the PLO as negotiating partners in the Middle East peace process. He added that as far as Britain was concerned, the PLO had changed. It would, therefore, be in the interests of the Israelis to talk to the PLO. But Israeli Premier, Yitzhak Shamir, saw in his party's victory in the just concluded local elections a strong endorsement of his government's policies which included refusal to talk to the PLO, supported implicitly by the Labour Party which, nevertheless, sup-

The Countdown

ported the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East.

According to the *Times of Zambia* of 10 March, 1989, Belgium had announced that she would expand diplomatic contacts with the PLO, to encourage what she called "moderation" by the PLO on the Middle East issues, the kind of moderation that was not reciprocated by Israel.

A Voice of America news broadcast on 11 March, 1989, reported the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa, for the first time ever, having unequivocally condemned apartheid.

South Africa faced a serious constitutional crisis on 13 March, 1989, when President P.W. Botha refused to yield to pressures to step down. Earlier, Mr. Botha's party colleagues held a meeting at which they agreed unanimously that he should hand over the presidency to the new party chief, F.W. de Klerk, and retire. But Mr. Botha retorted that he had no plan to retire and intended to resume office, from sick leave, on 15 March, 1989. Mr. Botha referred to Mr. de Klerk as a party puppet. Another meeting was to be held to persuade Mr. Botha to retire.

On 14 March, 1989, the United States Government advised the Israeli Government to create conditions that would contribute positively towards the peace process in the Middle East. The Israelis should ease their mailed-fisted policies towards the Palestinians and support peace efforts being made by their allies, in particular the United States. But Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, on a visit to the United States at the time, said in Washington that he did not believe that the US-PLO dialogue would contribute towards peace because the PLO were irretrievably committed to terrorism as was evidenced by their continued intrusions into Israel from Southern Lebanon, despite their declared intention to abandon all acts of terrorism, which had led to current contacts between themselves and the United States.

South Africa's Foreign Minister, Roelof Botha, paid a visit to London on 15 March, 1989, probably to seek the British Government's advice over the constitutional crisis facing his country where beleaguered President Botha had refused to step down as demanded by nearly all his colleagues who wanted newly elected National Party chief, F.W. de Klerk to take over. But according to South

The Countdown

Africa's constitution, Mr. Botha could not be forced out. He could only go if he agreed to.

And an unprecedented meeting took place in London between influential Afrikaners from Stellenbosch University and a group of Soviet intellectuals from Moscow's Africa Institute, led by Anatoly Gromyko, son of former Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko. The two teams were seeking more and better understanding of each other's country. In the wake of *perestroika* and *glasnost*, the Soviets would like to establish some contacts with South Africa, without giving up their support for the ANC, but stressing that they did not seek a violent overthrow of the South African Government.

Reacting to a statement by the United States Secretary of State, James Baker, that Israel, in the end, would have to talk to the PLO, Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, on 16 March, 1989, pointed out that the US stand might jeopardize chances of contacts between Israelis and moderate Arabs in the occupied territories. He cautioned that the US could not bank on a policy that had as yet to be proved practicable, i.e., dialogue between the Americans and the PLO.

On 17 March, 1989, the British Minister, Mr. Waldegrave, again decried Israeli policies in the occupied territories. He warned that the use of excessive force there would not break the aspirations of the Palestinian people, but would only lead to more bitterness and more breaches of human rights.

A Voice of America news broadcast on 17 March, 1989, reported Israeli Foreign Minister, Moshe Arens, as having said, whilst addressing Jewish leaders in Washington, that Israel might have to talk to the Palestinians, including the PLO but, he added, Israel would never talk to the PLO directly.

And Hungary in March, 1989, offered to play host to the much-discussed international peace conference on the Middle East. The Hungarians made the offer when PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, visited their country. Hungary also raised the status of the PLO envoy there to the ambassadorial level.

SWAPO President, Sam Nujoma, said in Lisbon, Portugal, on 20 March, 1989, that, if elected, his government would maintain a mixed economy in Namibia, allowing for both Government con-

The Countdown

trol and private enterprise. Independent Namibia would also assist the ANC of South Africa in its fight against apartheid and would maintain friendly relations with all countries of the world except South Africa, until there are free and democratic elections for all there, that would end apartheid.

The Americans and the PLO met again in Tunis on 22 March, 1989, against a background of unprecedented violence in the occupied territories. The PLO were expected to reassert their demands for an international peace conference on the Middle East; for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories and for the recognition of the state of Palestine by the Americans. On the other hand, the Americans were expected to ask the PLO to help ease the tension in the Middle East, *although it was the Israelis who were responsible for most of the tension in the region* (my own italics). This was the first meeting between the two since President Bush took office.

The Namibian transition to independence got under way on 1 April, 1989, but the ceasefire between South African troops and SWAPO guerrillas, part of the agreement between South Africa, Cuba and Angola, sanctioned by the United Nations, was in tatters hardly two days later as fighting broke out between the South African-backed Namibian forces and SWAPO guerrillas in Northern Namibia. South Africa accused SWAPO of violating the agreement by sending about one thousand guerrillas into Namibia from Southern Angola where they were supposed to be confined, under the terms of the agreement. But SWAPO denied this and said that their fighters were in the area awaiting confinement to their bases by the UN, when they were attacked. This appeared to place the Namibian independence process in jeopardy.

And Mrs Thatcher, the British Prime Minister, in Namibia, where she arrived on 1 April, 1989, was disturbed by the news of the fighting between the South African-backed Namibian troops and SWAPO guerrillas in the north of the country. She said that she would see to it that the Security Council met to discuss this disturbing development.

After talks with President Mubarak of Egypt on 4 April, 1989. President George Bush of the United States said both countries had shared goals in the Middle East. The two men agreed that Is-

The Countdown

rael should have secure borders and that Israel should withdraw from the occupied territories, i.e., the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Palestinians should achieve political rights. On the question of the international peace conference on the Middle East urged by Mr. Mubarak, Mr. Bush said that such a conference could play a useful role if properly structured. He added that the conference should not be a substitute for direct negotiations.

The United Nations Security Council on 4 April, 1989, endorsed South Africa's report that SWAPO guerrillas did cross into Northern Namibia from Angola, but, it added, they did so without hostile intent. Captured SWAPO guerrillas told UN investigators that they had been instructed not to attack South African troops. Fighting continued without any letup for the third day. The inherent weakness of the UN peace-keeping force was already exposed in that there was nothing they could do to stop the fighting. South African-backed Namibian troops were reported poised to wipe out the entire SWAPO force. Many were doubting the wisdom of the SWAPO move. But SWAPO stuck to its earlier statement that the guerrillas were in the area before the transitional process commenced and would not be pulled back. They would, on the contrary, await being confined to bases by the United Nations peace-keeping force. South Africa, on the other hand, had offered the guerrillas safe passage, back to Southern Angola, above parallel 16, as provided for by the agreement worked out by South Africa itself, Cuba and Angola, if the guerrillas agreed to lay down their arms and stopped fighting. Meanwhile, the Frontline heads of state held an urgent meeting in Luanda, Angola, at which they offered to send their own troops to stop the carnage in Northern Namibia. Chairman of the Frontliners, President Kaunda, said that he and his colleagues were not interested in apportioning blame, but would like to see that bloodshed in Namibia ended as soon as possible.

On a visit to Washington for talks with President George Bush, Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, on 7 April, 1989, announced his Government's plan to arrange for elections in the occupied territories of Palestine so that Palestinians could elect representatives with whom Israel could work out proposals for limited autonomy. He and Mr. Bush were agreed on their opposition to a separate Palestinian state. However, Mr. Bush empha-

The Countdown

sized that a way should be found to accommodate the PLO satisfactorily. PLO leaders at once aired their opposition to Mr. Shamir's plan which some of them described as "a non-starter".

On 9 April, 1989, SWAPO decided to pull its guerrillas out of Northern Namibia in 72 hours, should a ceasefire with South Africa be arranged. This constituted a major climbdown by the movement's president, Sam Nujoma, who had earlier insisted that his men had a right to be where they were and would, therefore, not leave. It was believed that the guerillas had suffered heavy casualties — about 200 killed and many more wounded. SWAPO denied this. Angola announced that she was ready to receive the guerillas back.

PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, called on President Kaunda at State House on 28 April, 1989. The President took the occasion to appeal to Israel to respond favourably to PLO peace initiatives in order to end the conflict in the Middle East.

In May, 1989, Mr. Arafat visited France at the invitation of the French Government, as Israel protested, viewing the invitation to Mr. Arafat as an unfriendly act by the French Government. However, France assured Israel that the friendship between the two countries remained untainted.

Mr. Arafat arrived in Paris on 2 May, 1989, for meetings with French President, Francois Mitterrand and other Government officials. This was the first official contact between the PLO and a West European government. Local Jewish leaders planned protest demonstrations against Mr. Arafat's presence in France, but other French groups which approved of PLO peace initiatives had also planned their demonstrations of support for Mr. Arafat and the PLO. The Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, called Mr. Arafat's presence in France, "an affront to the friendship between France and Israel". President Mitterrand took the occasion to urge Mr. Arafat to change or amend the clause in the constitution of his organization, which called for the destruction of Israel. He said that the clause was not consistent with the recent peace initiatives made by the PLO. Regarding the Israeli-proposed elections in the occupied territories, which the PLO had maintained could only be held after complete Israeli withdrawal from the territories, Mr. Mitterrand stressed that Israel needed secure borders. (BBC-VOA

The Countdown

news, 2 May, 1989).

Later, Mr. Arafat admitted that the PLO constitution advocating the destruction of Israel, was obsolete and should, therefore, be amended. A spokesman for the Israeli Prime Minister dismissed this and referred to Mr. Arafat as a "chronic liar" who had not kept many similar promises in the past. In Paris, an estimated 10 000 Jews demonstrated against Mr. Arafat's visit in front of a synagogue where a bomb believed to have been planted by Palestinians killed four people in 1980. And an Israeli soldier in the West Bank was detained for placing a Palestinian boy in front of a jeep as a shield against stones.

A summit of eight Central and Southern African states got under way in Luanda, Angola, on 16 May, 1989, to try and bring peace to Angola, torn by fourteen years of civil war. The talks were believed centred on relations between Angola and Zaire because, with South Africa having agreed to end its support for UNITA, as part of the Namibian independence agreement, Zaire was likely to replace South Africa as UNITA's main backer. The United States had restated its continued support for UNITA, and Zaire was the most convenient route for US arms shipments to UNITA. Zaire, in other words, was expected to play the role of proxy to the United States in that regard. That is, she would offer herself to function as a conveyer-belt to the United States for the purpose of meddling in the affairs of another African country.

United States Secretary of State, James Baker, on 23 May, 1989, appealed to the Israeli Government to get involved in a dialogue with the Palestinians. He urged them to open up to the Palestinians as their neighbours who deserved political rights. Israel, he counselled, should abandon the unrealistic dream of an Israel or *Eretz* Israel, the Zionists' cherished dream of a greater Israel stretching from the Nile in the West, to the Euphrates in the East. In that connection, they should desist from putting up more settlements in the occupied territories. Mr. Baker also urged Palestinians to adopt a more conciliatory attitude towards Israel. He was addressing the powerful and influential Jewish lobby in Washington. Mr. Baker's address was viewed as the most forthright and candid statement ever issued by the Bush Administration on US relations with Israel and on the Palestinian problem. This signi-

The Countdown

fied a departure from the Reagan Administration's protective attitude towards Israel and refusal to have anything to do with the PLO. Hitherto, the Bush Administration had been accused of lack of a clear-cut policy towards Israel vis-a-vis its relations with the Palestinians and towards a peaceful settlement of the Middle East impasse. It remained to be seen, however, how vigorously and consistently the Bush Administration could pursue this policy.

The Zambia DAILY MAIL of 3 June, 1989, referred to a meeting that had taken place between the Israeli Science Minister, Ezer Weizmann, and a senior PLO official close to Chairman Yasser Arafat in Geneva "yesterday", the paper said. Weizmann became the first Israeli cabinet minister ever to meet a PLO official, Israel Radio said. Mr. Weizman was to pay dearly for this later.

On 31 December, 1989, Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Shamir, sacked Weizmann who was a leading member of the Labour Party in the coalition led by Mr. Shamir for his contacts with the PLO, both direct and indirect, in breach of a law that forbade contacts between Israeli citizens and the PLO. Consistent with his stand, Weizmann had on several occasions in the past openly advocated contacts between the Government and the PLO. There was a growing tendency among the Israelis to go out and meet members of the PLO, in order to reduce tension in the area and as a step towards a peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question. Talking to the BBC on 1 January, 1990, Weizmann maintained that he was not the only Government minister that had talked to members of the PLO. "The Prime Minister himself talked to a gentleman called . . ." (a PLO man). According to Weizmann, the only difference between his contacts with the PLO and those of the Prime Minister was in the manner they spoke to members of the PLO. But, essentially, both men had spoken to representatives of the PLO. Moreover, the Government was considering meeting Palestinians, without the PLO, for talks, but, added Weizmann, "Palestinians are the PLO".

The dismissal of Ezer Weizmann threw the Government into a serious crisis and presented the Labour Party with a dilemma, i.e., to leave the coalition, which would be looked at with disfavour by the electorate or to continue, which would reduce their credibility. Moreover, the dismissal came hard on a peace demonstration

The Countdown.

held in Jerusalem on 30 December, 1989, by thousands of Israelis and Palestinians, urging the Government to establish contacts with the PLO. Earlier, on 29 December, 1989, a similarly mixed crowd of about 2 000 women, some carrying the Palestinian flag, marched from Modern Jerusalem to Ancient Jerusalem and were stopped by police using teargas.

Both the dismissal of Ezer Weizmann and the peace demonstrations represented a growing realization by the Israelis that the Palestinian question required a political rather than a military solution, resembling the growing feeling among the white people of South Africa that the Government there should enter into negotiations with representatives of the black majority.

Talks between representatives of the United States Government and those of the PLO were on 9 June, 1989, reported to have reached a very advanced stage, raising hopes of a comprehensive settlement. The two teams met for the third time in Tunis as tension and strife continued unabated in the occupied territories of Palestine and as more and more Palestinians died at the hands of Israeli soldiers who did not hesitate to resort to firearms.

United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, in a statement to the Security Council on 28 June, 1989, said that progress to Namibia's independence was threatened by former members of South Africa's paramilitary unit, the notorious Koevoet, whose heavily armed members had mingled with Namibian police and were terrorizing people in the north of the country. This had created conditions that were against free and fair elections in the country later in the year. In particular, the group's activities were inhibiting the return of Namibian refugees from neighbouring countries. Mr. de Cuellar appealed to South Africa to take immediate steps to remedy the situation. But South Africa denied the presence of Koevoet in Namibia, saying that she was irrevocably committed to the independence of Namibia and, therefore, would not do anything that would hamper this.

On 29 June, 1989, the new leader of the National Party of South Africa, Mr. F.W. de Klerk, addressing a special congress of the party in Pretoria, said that there had to be a new democratic system in the country, by which blacks would be allowed to share power with whites at all levels of government. Mr. de Klerk,

The Countdown

however, clarified this statement by saying that he was opposed to black domination replacing white domination. In other words, he was opposed to majority rule. He added that the new system would see to it that there was neither black nor white domination in South Africa. A few days earlier, Mr. de Klerk was in Europe where he visited a number of countries. He admitted wherever he went that reform in South African politics was necessary, and he would work towards that. In Britain, he met Mrs Thatcher who told him of the importance of releasing Nelson Mandela.

Mr. de Klerk thought that the new plan to give democratic rights to South Africans of all races would be tested over five years, during which period there would be consultations among leaders of all racial groups. But the leaders of the black community rejected the plan, saying that it smacked of apartheid, as, indeed, it did, and offered nothing substantial. ANC President, Oliver Tambo, described apartheid as "a crime that cannot be reformed or amended". And Archbishop Desmond Tutu believed the plan was a move designed to make apartheid feel more comfortable. (BBC-Radio RSA news, 29 June, 1989).

The Non-aligned nations, at their summit which opened on 4 September, 1989, in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, gave the status of head of state to PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, who was there to attend the summit.

The summit departed from its traditional anti-colonial stance to one of advocating co-operation with the industrialized Western World in solving the serious debt problem which affected virtually all members. United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, opening the summit, urged the nations present to do all they could in maintaining peace among the members of the movement, meaning, by implication, that they should not heap everything at the feet of the United Nations. Taking that cue, President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, deplored the movement's inability to contribute towards ending the conflict between Iran and Iraq, both of them member nations of the movement.

And the United States Government said on 9 September, 1989, that it intended to increase contacts with the ANC of South Africa, although it said it did not approve of the ANC's use of violence to bring about change in South Africa. This followed the

The Countdown

general election in South Africa, in which the ruling National Party emerged victorious, but with a substantially reduced majority. The US Government said that the ANC was the party that was representative of the majority of the people of South Africa and reflected the entire political spectrum of South Africa outside Government.

In Namibia, white extremists on 12 September, 1989, assassinated a white senior member of SWAPO, Anton Lubowski, Deputy Director of elections, whom they gunned down at his home in the Namibian Capital city of Windhoek only 36 hours before the return of SWAPO President, Sam Nujoma, from exile after an absence of thirty years. Following Lubowski's murder, SWAPO said that they would not be intimidated by threats of assassination or by actual assassination of some of their members.

Another South African city, East London, on 3 October, 1989, decided to do away with racial segregation in its public amenities, such as swimming pools, beaches, buses and parks, which were, hitherto, reserved for whites only. The first city to desegregate its public amenities was Johannesburg a few days earlier.

Continuing his diplomatic offensive, PLO Chairman, Yasser Arafat, arrived in Peking, China, on 5 October, 1989, for talks with Chinese leaders. Chinese Premier, Li Peng, outlining his country's proposals on the Middle East, suggested that there should be direct dialogue between the PLO and the Israeli Government and an international conference to be convened by the United Nations to decide the future of Palestine and Israel, which should be separated from each other as sovereign states, with Israel's security guaranteed.

And the Welsh National Rugby Union on 7 October, 1989, cut off all links with South Africa, which meant that the Welsh national team would, in future, not play in South Africa and South Africa would not be invited to play in Wales. Wales thus became the first British community to take that step on sporting links with South Africa. However, individual Welshmen would be free to play in South Africa, if they so wished. The Welsh move might put pressure on other rugby unions in Britain and elsewhere to do the same.

SWAPO romped home in the UN-supervised election, preparatory to independence expected in 1990, by capturing 41 seats out of 72 in the Constituent Assembly. They were followed by the

The Countdown

Democratic Turnhalle Alliance which won 21 seats. The rest went to the remaining of the ten parties which contested the seats. SWAPO said that they were satisfied with both the result and the manner the elections were conducted, which was "fair and free". This was echoed by the South African Government who said that they were ready to co-operate with the future government of Namibia, whoever led it. And at a Frontline states summit in Lusaka on 16 November, 1989, Chairman, President Kaunda, cautioned SWAPO President, Sam Nujoma, who attended, to be very careful in the manner he handled relations with South Africa. He warned against allowing South African nationalist liberation movements on Namibian soil, for this would be courting trouble with the Boer republic. Namibia's economy, President Kaunda continued, was completely in the hands of South Africa. So, Namibia could not behave like the rest of the Frontliners vis-a-vis support for the liberation movements.

This was seen as a timely and very realistic word of advice, which was indicative of the cautious approach the Frontliners had adopted in the measures they intended to take as their contribution towards resolving the South African political impasse, perhaps, counterbalancing the seemingly conciliatory attitude of South Africa's new leadership.

Barring an unforeseen catastrophe, Namibia independence in 1990 is a certainty.

We have seen that both Israel and South Africa owe their existence as states to British imperialism. They both came to function as outposts to watch over the political, economic and strategic interests of the West in the Middle East and in Southern Africa. There is this difference, however, in their relations with the West, led by the United States of America. Because of the strong and influential Jewish presence in the United States coupled with America's growing interests in the Middle East following the discovery of oil in the region, to which the United States sought to deny the Soviet Union access and from which the US sought to exclude Soviet influence, as well as fears of Soviet penetration of the Mediterranean region and South-East Europe, given rise to by the very strong communist presence in Italy which had the biggest communist party in West Europe and the threat this could

The Countdown

pose to the sea-route to the Far East through the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, Israel passed from British into American hands. On the other hand, South Africa, a dominion within the British Commonwealth of nations and for many years a very valuable member of the British Empire, watching, as she did, over the sea-route to India and the Far East and extremely rich in gold, diamonds and other minerals, continued under British influence because of the absence of Soviet interests which could attract the attention of the United States. Although she left the Commonwealth in 1961, South Africa, nevertheless, remained very close to Britain under whose influence she still is. But, after World War Two, as a result of super-power rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States, that immediately came to the fore and the resultant division of the world into two blocs, the communist and the capitalist blocs, the United States assumed the role of the protector and guarantor of security for all capitalist interests, to counterbalance the rôle Americans believed the Soviets played in the Communist world. Therefore, while Britain continued to watch over the interests of South Africa, she did so under the wings, so to speak, of the United States, her principal ally. So, British policy towards South Africa, such as dialogue rather than economic sanctions, is pursued with vigour only because the United States supports it, and the United States supports that British policy principally because the call for economic sanctions on South Africa has the support of the Soviet Union. The relationship between the United States and Britain in this regard is rather like what the Bembas say: “Mumbwe ukulila, pali uko ashintile amatako”. Literally translated, it is: “the jackal yaps only when he leans his buttocks against something.” Bemba folklore has it that there is a special friendship between the lion and the jackal. The jackal, a very timid animal indeed, because of that friendship, yaps only when he is aware that there is a lion about.

The foregoing sums up to one thing that American involvement is direct in Israel and indirect in South Africa, for reasons already given, and this partly explains why the Palestinians have a much tougher task to secure a home for themselves in the Middle East against the Zionist design to create a greater Israel (Eretz Israel), taking up most of the region, than the Africans in South Africa have in dismantling apartheid. However, history has shown that

The Countdown

no force, however insurmountable it might appear, can stop a people justifiably seeking peace, independence, freedom and human dignity, as is demonstrable by the failures of the Roman, Greek, Turkish and Austro-Hungarian empires, to name only a few powerful empires that failed to keep in perpetual subservience restless subjects who sought independence and freedom. The quest for freedom in man is, in other words, irrepressible. Man will always want to be free, even at the risk of grave danger, as was demonstrated by the Warsaw Ghetto uprising of April, 1943, when the oppressed, the hunted down, the butchered people of the Warsaw Ghetto, in some cases with their bare hands, threw themselves at men armed with machine guns and other weapons of mass destruction and grappled with them for nearly one month, in the name of freedom, before they were overcome. But their butchers never got away with it.

History has also demonstrated that no nation can attain peace and stability through wanton killing of human beings and destruction of property. One indisputable fact of history is that an individual, by extension a nation, attains peace, stability or prosperity only through respect for other individuals or nations. For human life is so ordained that whoever wantonly tramples on it or abuses it in any way whatsoever, never gets away with it. We have seen why.

It has slowly dawned on the nations responsible for the existence of Israel and South Africa, as they are today, that something ought to be done to alleviate the plight of millions of people, Palestinians and Africans, who, through no fault of their own suffer as a result of these two states coming into being, with a view to end the conflict in the Middle East and South Africa. Human decency demands this.

It is encouraging to note that a few ripples of hope have, of late, been noticed in an otherwise ocean of indifference and complacency. The United States Government began talking to the PLO at the end of 1988 for the first time, directly, but only after the PLO had recognized Israel's right to existence and renounced the use of violence as a way to bring about change in the Middle East, another sign of hope, although there has been no Israeli reciprocation. Humanity demands that the Israelis make a corresponding gesture, whatever this may be, instead of obdurately holding back. They should try and give the PLO peace initiative a chance, as,

The Countdown

indeed, they have been urged to by a number of their friends in the West, including the French and the British. But, of course, the only friend of Israel, who matters is the United States, which has been talking to the PLO since the end of 1988. Won't Israel go along? Israel is not likely to go along, unless the United States puts pressure on her. The Americans, on the other hand, are not likely to put pressure on Israel, unless the Arab world as a whole shows determination and seriousness in its relations with America vis-a-vis the Palestine question. Herein lies a great challenge to the Arab world. Won't the Arabs turn their very many contacts with the United States into a profitable channel to bring to Washington's awareness the desirability of accommodating the Palestinians, the way they themselves are seeking. The Bush administration has come up with some rather encouraging pronouncements on the Palestinian question, that require further exploration and vigorous pushing on the part of the Arabs.

However, one thing clear is that Israel will not remain obdurate and opposed to peaceful change for ever. Nor will the Americans always back Israel to the hilt, as they have done since the Jewish state came into being. There will come a time when the Americans will not allow themselves to be saddled with the problems of Israel in the face of what may be happening elsewhere in the world. For instance, the dramatic changes now taking place in Eastern Europe might contribute towards a drastic change in American policy towards the Middle East in general, and towards Israel in particular. The Americans may not want to see regions of conflict, such as the Middle East and South Africa, endure in the so-called free world, after the Russians and their allies have cleansed their world of conflict. What would "free world" mean in that event?

But, the mere fact that even the Israelis, tough and obdurate, as they have always shown themselves to be, are now talking of their readiness to meet "moderate" Palestinians, is certainly a sign of change for the better in the Middle East. For it has been said that so long as men with differences engage themselves in talking — any talking — there is always hope of reaching some understanding, and this works for reduction in tension and likelihood of conflict. Some ten years ago, talking of any kind at all between Israelis and Palestinians, was unthinkable. The Americans, likewise,

The Countdown

refused to talk to the Palestinians, except through intermediaries. What has brought about this apparent Israeli-American change of heart? I call it apparent because there are signs of cautious treading in both camps. Whereas the Israelis can only talk to "moderate" Palestinians, and not to the PLO whatever happens, the Americans, whilst talking to the PLO, can only manoeuvre in a manner that will not alarm the Israelis. But change, nonetheless, there has been in the American-Israeli attitude towards the Palestinians. What has caused this change?

Certainly, the change from Mr. Reagan to Mr. Bush has had something to do with this American change in policy towards the Palestinian question, slight change though it is. Changes in the Communist world and changed world opinion, as a result of the PLO diplomatic offensive, are another factor. There is bound to be more change, should the PLO and the Arab world show greater determination.

On the other hand, it has been suggested in some quarters that, since Israel and South Africa co-operate so closely in pursuance of their almost identical policies in their respective domains, shouldn't the Palestinians and the black people of South Africa, themselves, perforce co-operate more closely, if they do at all, in the face of what is, quite obviously, a common enemy? The benefits of such co-operation cannot be overemphasized. For one thing, there is much that the Palestinians and the black people of South Africa can learn from each other. It is important that the already existing bonds of friendship and co-operation between the Arabs and black Africans should be strengthened and turned into channels of aid to both the Palestinians and the black people of South Africa.

Although most of Southern Africa is rid of colonialism and foreign rule, South Africa is far from overcome, even without Namibia. For despite the seemingly conciliatory attitude of South Africa's new President, F.W. de Klerk, apartheid still dominates the lives of the people of South Africa. The so-called reform programme introduced by Mr. de Klerk, has affected only the incidentals to apartheid. Fundamental issues remain untouched. For instance blacks still have no political rights. They have no vote and,

The Countdown

therefore, remain unrepresented in the South African Parliament. They are citizens of South Africa, in other words, only in name. Blacks are still discriminated against purely on the basis of their race or colour, in virtually every sphere of South African life. They have no right to decent homes, education, employment, medical care. They remain unprotected by South African law, as citizens of any country should be. They have no place in South Africa, as citizens of that state, in terms of the apartheid system. They belong elsewhere — the Bantustans — and their presence in South Africa, it has repeatedly been stated by the white ruling class, is on sufferance for economic reasons only, i.e., they are valued for their ability to provide labour only. Salaries or wages paid blacks remain the lowest. Blacks are still denied freedom of speech, association or movement. They still remain, as a people, without land and, therefore, as individuals, without freehold rights. All these in the land of their birth!

However, since the beginning of the Namibian peace process, soon after the fight for Cuito Cuanavale in South-East Angola towards the end of 1987, the trend of events in South Africa itself, has pointed in one direction only, the direction of the defeat of apartheid, as illustrated in this chapter. The same trend, although somewhat with less clarity, is nonetheless noticeable in the Middle East, to the same end, i.e., the defeat of Zionism in the region.

Israeli obduracy or South Africa's ambiguity (Mr. de Klerk's style of administering the country, as far as blacks are concerned), do not impress very many people. In Southern Africa, people have grown accustomed to such taunts as: that only a mad man could separate Rhodesians; that there never would be majority rule in "my lifetime", (40 years) and that the black man's presence in urban South Africa was "on sufferance" only, for economic reasons, made by some of the most powerful representatives of foreign interests Southern Africa has ever known: Sir Roy Welensky of the Central African Federation fame, Mr. Ian Smith of Rhodesia and Dr. H.F. Verwoerd, the brains behind apartheid in South Africa from about 1950 to the present moment, i.e., 1989. What Welensky and Smith represented is no more, and Verwoerd's dream is threatened both from within and from without, with collapse. Israel will not hold out for very long either. For the conflict

The Countdown

between the Jews and the Arabs in the Middle East, like the conflict between the Boers and the black peoples of South Africa, is, as we have seen earlier, essentially a contest between the forces of that which is wrong, bad or evil, on the one hand, and the forces of that which is right, good or morally defensible, on the other. Whenever and wherever Right and Wrong are in conflict, Right, of necessity, will always triumph over Wrong. This is the irresistible and unalterable trend of history.

Acknowledgements

BBC and VOA news broadcasts and commentaries constituted a very important source of information, particularly on events in the Middle East and Southern Africa. Other equally important sources have been the following books, brochures and magazines:-

Albert Luthuli — *Let My People Go* — Fontana Books, London, 1962.

South Magazine — November, 1986; March, 1988.

Newsweek Magazine — April 2, 1979; Nov. 5, 1979; August, 1981; March 24, 1986.

Mary Benson — *The Struggle For A Birthright* — Penguin Books, 1966.

Robert B. Ashmore — *Israel and South Africa: A Natural Alliance* — PLO Unified Information.

Israel Shahak — *Israel and South Africa: The Ideological Common Ground* — PLO Unified Information.

Yossi Melan and Dan Raviv — *Israel-South African Relations: The Power of Realpolitik* — PLO Unified Information.

Princess Elizabeth of Toro — *African Princess* — Spectrum Books, Ibadan, 1983.

Denis Herbstein — *White Man, We Want To Talk To You* — Pelican, London, 1978.

African Magazine — Issue No. 39, November, 1974.

Amnesty International — *Israeli Iron Fist* — Excerpts from a report for August, 1988.

Trevor Huddleston — *Naught For Your Comfort* — Fontana Books, London, 1956.

Henry Cattani — *Jerusalem: Israeli Concepts, Policies and Practices* — International Symposium, Washington DC, 1985.

Acknowledgements

Carlton J.H. Hayes — *Modern Europe To 1870* — Macmillan, 1960.

Nelson Mandela — *No Easy Walk To Freedom* — Heinemann, London, 1965.

Kenneth M. Lewan — *Palestinian Resistance To Israeli Settlements* — International Symposium, Washington DC, 1985.

Lorne Kenny — *The Impact of Israeli Settlements on Peace Efforts: Present and Future* — International Symposium, Washington DC, 1985.

Richard Falk — *The Status of Israeli Settlements in The West Bank Under International Law and International Forums* — International Symposium, Washington DC, 1985.

Alfred T. Moleah — *Israel and South Africa: Partners in Repression* — Palestinian Research and Educational Centre, Washington DC, 1984.

Paul Theodoulou — *Palestinian Children and the Intifada* — Bisan Press, Cyprus, 1989.

Alexander Hepple — *Vorwoed* — Penguin Books, 1967.

RIGHT IS MIGHT



Abraham Chibamba was born on 21 October, 1934, in Harare, Zimbabwe, of Zambian parents. He spent part of his boyhood at his maternal grandfather's village, Sampa, on the banks of Chambeshi River, east of Kasama, where he also first went to school. Having completed Standard Two at the head of his class in May, 1947, young Chibamba was selected by the White

Fathers of Malole Mission to enter Lubushi Seminary to study for the priesthood, in October the same year. In 1956, he was back in Harare at the Jesuits' Major Seminary to study Philosophy which he completed 'Magna Cum Laude' (with great praise) in 1958. He entered the Pius XII University College at Roma, Maseru, Lesotho, in 1961, and read English and History for a Bachelor of Arts degree which he obtained in 1963. Back in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), Chibamba joined the Northern Rhodesia Broadcasting Corporation as announcer/producer and newscaster, English Service, the only local young man on the service at the time. He later studied broadcasting techniques and journalism at the BBC in London in 1965. He also served in Zambia's diplomatic missions at the United Nations and China. A brilliant scholar and gifted linguist, Chibamba speaks, in addition to his native Bemba: English, French, Shona, Nyanja, some Sotho and some Chinese. He is also an accomplished musician an organist. Other books written by Abraham Chibamba are: *Uwakalema Takaleka* (Bemba) and *Samora Machel: His Spirit Marches On* (English).